Class 265.3231 Book K77

General Theological Seminary Library

Ninth Ave. and 20th St., New York 1843

Besides the main topic this book also treats of

Subject No.	*On page*	*Subject No.*	*On page*

H

Presented by
The Rt. Rev. William R. Whittingham, D.D.,
Dei Gratiâ, Bp. of Maryland
Feb. 1863.

69 i P

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/treatiseonuseimp0000alex

A

TREATISE

ON THE

USE AND IMPORT

OF THE

EUCHARISTIC SYMBOLS:

BY

ALEXANDER KNOX, ESQ.

WITH

A PREFATORY LETTER AND A POSTSCRIPT,

BY THE AUTHOR;

AND AN APPENDIX,

EXTRACTED FROM BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR.

BALTIMORE:
JOSEPH ROBINSON.
1843.

GEN. THEOL. SEM. OF THE PROT. EPISC. CH.

500
265.323I
K77
1843

LETTER TO JOHN S. HARFORD, ESQ. PREFATORY TO THE TREATISE ON THE EUCHARIST.

July 19, 1826.

MY DEAR MR. HARFORD,

YOUR most acceptable letter, of the 11th of May, found me actually engaged in a reply to your query, in a former letter, respecting the sense, in which I supposed the term ξμαθον, to contain a notion of philosophy: and I also wished to explain more fully, in what respect I conceived it to differ from the latter word, μεμύημαι. I began my letter as soon as I was free from some indispensable matters which had occupied me: but the subject you have last brought before me, calls, I think, for more immediate attention; and I, therefore, hasten to give you, the best information of which I am capable.

But I must not proceed, without first thanking you cordially, for obtaining me the sight of the Bishop of ———'s letter. I am deeply gratified by the approbation it contains, the spirit of it being such as I could alone seriously value; I return it, with many thanks to Sir Thomas Acland for parting with it. It strengthens my purpose (God willing) of prefixing

an introductory preface to my tract, and giving it to the public. *When* I may be able, however, (from another engagement which hangs upon me,) I cannot conjecture; as I advance with such a snail's pace in every thing.

The subject to which you turn my attention, I am scarcely qualified to write upon; as I have never actually examined the volumes of the Fathers respecting it. The truth is, I was so completely satisfied with the quotations which I had met, in trustworthy writers of later times, that I felt, as I thought, no necessity for going farther.

The impression on my mind has been, that the ancient writers of the Church were agreed in ascribing, to the consecrated elements in the Eucharist, an unutterable and efficacious mystery, in virtue of our Saviour's words of institution, by which he had made those elements, when consecrated after his example, the vehicles of his saving and sanctifying power: and, in that respect, the permanent representatives of his incarnate person. But, notwithstanding this exalted estimate of the Eucharist, the notion of a literal transubstantiation, such as was subsequently introduced into the Western Church, would appear never to have entered into their mind.

I am brought to this conclusion, by the obvious fact, that those early writers always recognize, the continuance, after consecration, of the same natural substances, notwithstanding the heavenly properties

with which they have become invested. I need not point out to you the radical difference, between this theory, and that of transubstantiation. The latter notion, you know, supposes, that the substances of bread and wine exist no longer; that their outside form alone continues, and serves as a veil for the flesh and blood, into which, through consecration, they have been transmuted. That such is the strict import of transubstantiation, appears from the remarkable words of even the politic Bossuet:—"Comme il désiroit exercer notre foi dans ce mystère, et en même temps nous ôter l'horreur de manger sa chair, et de boire son sang, en leur propre espèce, il étoit convenable qu'il nous les donnât, enveloppés sous une espèce étrangère."—Exposition de la Doctrine, &c., § x.*

I need not tell you, that nothing like this has ever been found in the Fathers. Some few of them seem to have supposed, that the sacramental elements were so sublimated, by the divine purpose to which they served, that they were not liable to the entire process undergone by common aliments; but, as Cyril of Jerusalem expresses it (Mystic Catechis. v.), are distributed through the whole substance of the communicant, for the good of body and soul: and where

* Since He desired to exercise our faith in the mystery, and, at the same time, to spare us the shock of eating His flesh, and drinking His blood, in their proper form, it was fitting that He should give us them under a different form.

I find this quotation, I am also informed, that some early writer preserved in Chrysostom's volumes, and St. John Damascene, held the same opinion.

But, even this fanciful notion implies, that the doctrine of transubstantiation was not then known; as, if entertained, it would have left no room for such a supposition. That superstitious views of the Christian mysteries should more and more prevail, in proportion as the Roman Empire became involved in intellectual darkness, was too natural; and, therefore, it is the more remarkable, that the real tenet of transubstantiation should not have been propounded, until about the year 820, or 830.

It is very satisfactory, that this doctrinal revolution is sufficiently acknowledged, by all Roman Catholic writers. They tell us, that Paschasius Radbertus, a monk of the abbey of Corbey, in the diocese of Amiens, was its promulgator. The words of Card. Bellarmine (now lying before me,) are, "Hic auctor primus fuit, qui serio, et copiose scripsit, de veritate Corporis et sanguinis Domini in Eucharistiâ."* And it is remarked by L'Avocat, with the candour which distinguishes him, in his Dictionnaire Historique Portatif, that "Ce traité fit grand bruit du tems de Charles le Chauve;" and he adds this remarkable fact, that, though Paschasius had, in the meantime, been made abbot, the disputes which his book occa-

* He was the first author, who wrote on the reality of the Body and Blood in the Sacrament, earnestly, and at large.

sioned, "pointes à quelques brouilleries qu'on lui suscita, le porterent à se démettre de son abbaie."*

But the most interesting circumstance in this conjuncture was, that Paschasius' book had not long appeared, when it received a luminous and powerful answer. A monk of the same monastery, Bertram or Ratram by name, was required, by the above-mentioned Charles the Bald, to state what he thought respecting Paschasius' doctrine. His being thus called upon, shows Bertram to have been regarded as an eminent divine in his day. He obeyed the call; and his work happily remains to us, unimpaired, and unadulterated. It is admirably written, for that time; and manifests the author's close consideration, and deeply digested knowledge, of the subject.

Paschasius had maintained two positions, which he thus expressed; "Although, in the sacrament, there be the figure of bread and wine, yet we must believe it, after consecration, to be nothing else, but the body and blood of Christ;" and the more clearly to convey his meaning, he proceeds, "and to say something yet more wonderful, it is no other flesh than that, which was born of Mary, suffered on the cross, and rose again from the grave." Accordingly, two questions were proposed to Bertram, 1st, whether "Quod in Ecclesia, ore fidelium sumitur, Corpus et Sanguis

* This Treatise made a great noise, in the time of Charles the Bald; and, combined with certain vexatious annoyances which were stirred against him, induced him to resign his abbacy.

Christi in mysterio fiat, an in veritate ?"* 2d, "Utrum ipsum Corpus sit quod de Maria natum est et passum, mortuum et sepultum, quodque resurgens, et cœlos ascendens, ad dextram Patris consideat ?"† These two points, therefore, form the subject of Bertram's discourse: he first shows, from the nature and import of the institution, that the Eucharist contains not the physical verity, but the spiritual mystery of our Saviour's body and blood; and then proceeds to expose the utter absurdity of imagining that the natural body, and the eucharistical body, are one and the same. In this second part of his work, he strongly supports himself by quotations, from St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Isidore, Fulgentius, and, above all, from St. Augustine; and from this concurrent evidence, triumphantly establishes his agreement, with the judgment of the Catholic Church.

I cannot but regard this little work, as a signal link, in the mysterious chain of Providence. When it pleased the wisdom of heaven to permit the introduction of that monstrous novelty, transubstantiation, it was of infinite importance, that provision should have been made for exposing the fabricated error, and ascertaining the Catholic truth, in some direct and unfal-

* Whether the Body and Blood of Christ, which is in the Church received by the mouths of the faithful, be such, in a mystery, or in Truth?

† Whether it be the same Body which was born of Mary, and suffered, died, and was buried, and rising again, and ascending into Heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father?

lacious way, so soon as minds should arise, fitted for such an investigation. I suppose it would be impossible to imagine a more adequate expedient, for such a purpose, than the powerful protest, and perspicuous memorial of Bertram, so imperatively required, and so opportunely furnished. That it should have had little effect at the time, was but natural, considering the general state of the Western Church. What St. Peter says of the ancient prophets, that, "not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister, the things which are now reported unto us," so, in a certain sense, may be said of Bertram's treatise. Still, it cannot be doubted, that, even in those days of darkness, the rallying point thus afforded, to such as desired to stand in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, (Jer. vi. 16.) was by no means neglected. Of this we have an interesting proof, in the Saxon Homily for Easter, which is inserted in the 2d volume of Fox's Acts and Monuments; and which is said to have been translated into that language, from the Latin, about the year 970, by Ælfric, Abbot of Malmsbury. This curious discourse, though in its present form, more than a century later than Bertram's book, not only maintains the same doctrine, but, in most of its leading passages, is strictly copied from Bertram. It seems, however, that, after the tenth century, the new opinion became predominant; until, at length, in the fourth council of Lateran, (1215) under Innocent the Third, it was formally adopted, as the established doctrine of the church; and, to prevent

the possibility of evading its grossest sense, it was designated by the new term of transubstantiation; in order that there might be a convenient verbal test for detecting heretics at once, without the trouble of discussion.

An English translator of Bertram, who has also given the original, and prefixed a very useful preliminary discourse, thus summarily describes his author's views:—"Ratramnus determines, that the words of our Saviour, in the institution of the holy Eucharist, are not to be taken properly, but figuratively; and that the consecrated elements, orally received by the the faithful, are not the true body of Christ, but the figure and sacrament of it; though not mere empty figures, or naked signs, void of all efficacy; but such as, through the blessing annexed to our Saviour's institution, and the powerful operation of the spirit of Christ, working in, and by, those sacred figures, is the communion of the body and blood of Christ." That you may judge of the fairness of this statement, I will give you one passage from Bertram himself:—"In Sacramento Corporis et Sanguinis Domini, quicquid exterius sumitur, ad corporis refectionem aptatur. Verbum autem Dei, qui est panis invisibilis, invisibiliter in illo existens Sacramento, invisibiliter, participatione sui, fidelium mentes vivificando pascit.*

* In the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, whatsoever is outwardly received, serves only for the refreshment of the body. But the Word of God, who is the invisible bread, being invisibly in the Sacrament, doth, in an invisible manner, nourish and quicken the souls of the faithful, by their partaking thereof.

The Reformation naturally brought this long neglected tract to light; and several editions of it were printed in Cologne, Basle, Geneva, and elsewhere. Theprotestants triumphed in being able to produce such a refutation, of the claim to antiquity set up by their opponents; and to these latter it seemed, at first, the readiest expedient, to reject Bertram's book as spurious, and got up for the occasion. But they were beaten off this ground, by indubitable proofs of its authenticity. Copies of it were found to exist, of a date far anterior to the Reformation; and where none but Roman Catholics could have had access. At length, it was republished by themselves; and, to the honour of its editor, in an unadulterated form; accompanied, however, with every possible ingenious effort to prove its Roman Catholic orthodoxy. "Cet ouvrage," says L'Avocat, "parut d'abord favorable à l'erreur des Protestants, sur la réalité du corps de J. C. dans l'Eucharistie; ce qui porta plusieurs savans à le regarder comme un livre hérétique et supposé. Mais le père Mabillon en montra clairement, dans la suite, l'authenticité. M. Boileau, docteur de Sorbonne, qui en a donné une excellente édition, en Latin et en François, prouve que l'ouvrage est orthodoxe."*

* This work appeared at first to favour the error of the Protestants, concerning the real presence of the body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist; a circumstance which induced many learned men to regard the book as heretical and supposititious. But Father Mabillon, subsequently, established its authenticity beyond dispute. M. Boileau, Doctor of the Sorbonne, who gave an excellent edition of it, in Latin and French, proves that the work is orthodox.

The honesty of this last position I doubt not; as to its correctness, impartial common sense will determine.

It is remarkable, however, that Bellarmine (whose estimate of Paschasius' work, I have already quoted,) was so far from accounting Bertram's treatise to be orthodox, that he has not deigned to give its author a place amongst his "Scriptores Ecclesiastici;"* though, in remarking on the works of St. Augustine, he expressly refers to Bertram's book, for evidence, that a particular tract was written, not by St. Augustine, but by Fulgentius. But it is still more worthy of notice, that, to lessen the authority of Bertram's work, and to add strength to that of Paschasius, Bellarmine (it would seem knowingly) misrepresents fact, by stating, that Paschasius' tract was written to oppose the new doctrine of Bertram, instead of Bertram's treatise being written to repel the innovation of Paschasius. After the words which I transcribed above, he adds, "contra Bertramum Presbyterum, qui fuit ex primis qui eam," (veritatem corporis et sanguinis, &c.) in dubium revocarent.† I give you this curious misrepresentation as I find it, because it seems itself, to speak a volume. I lament to find it in Bellarmine; as, in his early days at

* A small volume, containing an enumeration, and brief characters, of all Catholic writers: its title is "De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis."

† Against Bertram, a priest, who was one of the first that called the reality of the body and blood in question.

least, he was a pious man. Unfortunately, the Roman Catholic religion does not inspire, though it does not always destroy, a love of truth.

L'Avocat, on the other hand, being far above such wretched subterfuges, states the matter as it was: "Ce traité," says he (that of Paschasius,) "fit grand bruit, &c.; et Bertram, autrement Ratramme, et quelques autres, écrivèrent contre Paschase Radbert."*

I advise you to get Bertram's tract; (which I shall have occasion to return to, before I end my letter,) but I could greatly wish you to have, also, Mons. L'Arroque's History of the Eucharist. A very satisfactory translation of this work, published in London 1684, lies now before me; and I suppose you could easily procure it from sellers of old books. It is not a book to be read from beginning to end; but the "Table of Chapters" will lead you to what is worthy of attention. The author cannot be suspected of any ultra Catholic prejudices, being himself a French protestant; yet he seems so honestly intent on telling the truth, and nothing but the truth, as to raise a high idea, both of the weight of his evidence, and of his own upright disposition.

He enters, at large, into the very point, on which you wish for satisfaction. A large part of his work is occupied, in examining, and ascertaining, what the ancient fathers thought on the subject of the Eucha-

* This Treatise made a great noise; and Bertram, or Ratram, and some others, wrote against Paschasius Radbertus.

rist; and it seems to me, that the enquiry could not have been pursued with stricter attention, or with more Christian candour.

As you may not at once find L'Arroque, I will give you an extract from his preface; which, at the same time, shows the spirit with which he prosecuted his subject, and the impression left upon his mind, by his close and extensive investigation.

"The first thing to be done," he says, "when we set about reading the monuments, which we still enjoy, of ecclesiastical antiquity, is, well to examine ourselves to see whether we be free from all kinds of pre-occupation. For, provided we bring unto this study nothing of our own, but attention, and a sincere desire of knowing the truth, we shall gather fruits full of consolation and joy; and we shall doubtless discover what has been the belief of those ancient doctors, upon the point which we examine. Secondly, great heed must be taken not to separate, what God hath joined together: I mean, the nature and the matter of the symbols, from their efficacy, and from their virtue, in their lawful use: for then, these things are inseparable, although they be different, one from another; for the nature of bread and wine is one thing, and the grace and virtue, which the consecration addeth to their nature, is another thing: and therefore it is, that the holy Fathers speak not so honourably of the sacrament, when they consider the substance of the symbols, as when they regard their

efficacy and virtue. And, indeed, when they have a design to represent this efficacy, they make use of the loftiest, and most magnificent expressions, to raise the dignity of this mystery, and to make us conceive a grand idea of it."

I think you will consider this last remark, in particular, as applying to the matter which you wish to have cleared up; but, that you may more fully understand L'Arroque's meaning, I must transcribe what he says elsewhere, in the same preface, respecting the exact notion of the eucharistical mystery, entertained by the ancient fathers. His words are, "And, indeed, not to leave their doctrine exposed unto the strokes of calumny, they declare, that, if the Eucharist be a figure, and an image, it is not a bare figure, or an image without operation; but a figure, an image, and a sacrament, replenished with all the virtue, and all the efficacy, of the body and blood of our blessed Saviour; clothed, if it may be so said, with the majesty of his person; and accompanied, in the lawful celebration, with all the fruits, and with all the benefits, of his death and sufferings."

To these extracts from L'Arroque's preface, I cannot help adding the twofold conclusion, which he deduces (part ii. chap. 3.) from a copious induction of passages most directly bearing upon the subject.

"From all these considerations of the holy Fathers, which we have alleged, there result two doctrines from their writings, both which have been their

foundation for the virtue and efficacy, which they attribute unto the Sacrament; the first is, that they regard it as a sacrament, which not only barely signifies, but which also exhibits, and communicates unto the believing soul, the thing which it signifies: I mean the body and blood of Jesus Christ. The second doctrine, which results from the hypothesis of the Fathers, is, that, considering that the death of Christ is the cause of our life, which life consists in the sanctification of our souls, by means whereof we have communion with God, which is the lively fountain of life, (and, therefore, before conversion, we are said to be dead,) they have attributed unto the sacrament, the virtue of sanctifying and quickening us."

The evidences which he produces, to show that the Fathers had not the remotest thought of transubstantiation, are so numerous, and so connected in their import with the context, that I cannot attempt to select specimens, especially as I hope you will soon possess the book yourself. I need therefore only observe farther, that, while L'Arroque seems himself to have cordially concurred with the Fathers, in their views of the Eucharist; and while, in the sequel of his work, he faithfully and circumstantially relates the rise of the new doctrine, and gives Bertram all his just credit; he does not seem to have sufficiently adverted to the fact, that Bertram did not maintain what hassince become the popular doctrine of Pro-

testants, but that he embodied, in a compendious form, that primitive temperament of truth, from which too many Protestants have as much deviated on one side, as the followers of Paschasius have done on the other. L'Arroque appears, strangely enough, to suppose that Protestants, generally, think as he himself thinks: whereas, it seems, he might have found it a fact, that even the early opposers of Paschasius were not, in every instance, of the same judgment with Bertram. One writer, in particular, Johannes Scotus Erigena, is represented as having taught "quod sacramentum Altaris, non verum Corpus, et verus Sanguis, sit Domini, sed tantum memoria veri Corporis et Sanguinis ejus:"* and I should think, that the celebrated Berengarius, who lived in the next century, agreed, not with Bertram, but with Johannes Scotus Erigena; inasmuch as he owned himself a disciple of the latter, but never once mentioned Bertram; a silence no otherwise to be accounted for, considering Bertram's notoriety, than by supposing, that Berengarius did not concur in the doctrine, which Bertram had contended for. The probability is that, while Bertram resisted an aggressive error, in the very spirit, which in later times, has distinguished the Church of England,—I mean that of consulting, next to the Holy Scriptures,

* That the Sacrament of the Altar is not the very Body, and very Blood of the Lord, but only a remembrance of His very Body and Blood.*

* A quotation in the Introduction to the English edition of Bertram, p. 58.

the clear and decided current of Christian antiquity, —J. Scotus Erigena, and Berengarius,* preferred, on the same principle by which, since that time, all sectaries have been actuated, to rest exclusively on Holy Scripture, interpreted by the light of their own minds.

I am thus brought to the point, on account of which I meant to return to Bertram; I mean the providential link, which his book appears to form, in the history of our English Church. Such a testimony, against a doctrinal excess, which formed one of the main topics of dispute, delivered at so critical a juncture, by so respectable an authority, could not have been regarded with indifference, by the first Protestants on the continent, whatever might be their own specific opinions. But, in England, Bertram was not merely valued as an ally; he was looked up to by the wise and excellent Ridley, as his master: not, however, as teaching him any very long-lost truth, but as opening to his mind an undelusive vista, through which, the uniform agreement of the Church, for eight hundred years, appeared to him in the most direct opposition to the modern dogma of transubstantiation. The light which Ridley thus received, he

* The case of Berengarius has been recorded, by all writers of Ecclesiastical History. The ardour with which he promulgated his doctrine, subjected him to the censure of the ruling powers; and, after having infused a leaven which spread through thousands, he is said himself to have recanted. L'Arroque seems to consider the persons now called Vaudois, as having derived their origin, from the secession caused by the zeal of Berengarius.

speedily communicated to Cranmer; and the doctrine of Bertram was, accordingly, embodied, in the first reformed Communion service of 1548. But stability not being an ingredient in Cranmer's mental character; which was also defective, it should seem, in that taste, and elevation of spirit, which qualified Ridley for appreciating the Catholic tradition, which Bertram presented to his view, the poor Archbishop soon swerved from his teacher, and embraced the frigid notions of certain continental divines; under whose guidance, the Communion service was remodified, as far as was deemed expedient, in conformity to Cranmer's new views. No doubt, this change was permitted for wise purposes; but I rejoice to think, that, at length, a time came, for a far wiser and happier revision.

That Ridley deeply lamented the new notions and measures of Cranmer, his words, in a letter to one of his former chaplains, (which I have quoted in my tract on the Eucharist,) give ground to conclude, because they can apply to nothing else. "You have," he says, "known me long indeed; in which time, it hath chanced me, as, you say, to mislike some things. It is true, I grant; for sudden changes, without substantial and necessary cause, and the heady setting forth of extremities, I did never love."

In fact, Ridley must have been affected, as he states, by the altered Communion service; because we know from himself, that his adherence to Bertram

remained unshaken to the last. His own words, with which he concludes one of his defences at Oxford, are the best evidence of his cordial perseverance in the Catholic principles, which he had so deliberately adopted. After having appealed to more than twelve ancient writers, he thus proceeds:—"Here, right worshipful Mr. Prolocutor, and ye, the rest of the Commissioners, it may please you to understand, that I do not lean to those things only, which I have written in my former answers and confirmations; but that I have also, for the proof of that I have spoken, whatsoever Bertram, (a man learned, of sound and upright judgment, and ever counted a Catholic for these seven hundred years, until this our age,) hath written. This treatise, whosoever shall read and weigh, considering the time of the writer, his learning, godliness of life, the allegation of the ancient Fathers, and his manifold, and most grounded arguments, I cannot doubtless but much marvel, if he have any fear of God at all, how he can, with good conscience, speak against him in this matter of the Sacrament. This Bertram was the first that pulled me by the ear, and that first brought me from the common error of the Romish Church, and caused me to search more diligently and exactly, both the Scriptures, and writings of the old ecclesiastical Fathers, concerning this matter. And this I protest, before the face of God, who knoweth I lie not in the things I now speak."

On another occasion, in the same disputation, we find, if possible, a still more express avowal of Ridley's perfect concurrence with Bertram, in the very notion in which Cranmer had appeared to desert him. "Finally," says Ridley, "with Bertram, I confess, that Christ's body is in the sacrament in this respect, namely, as he writeth, because there is in it the spirit of Christ, that is, the power of his word, which not only feedeth the soul, but also cleanseth it." Had, however, these declarations of Ridley remained to us only as historical records, their weight, at this day, would be little more, than that of respectable individual authority. But, though the venerable bishop had lost his influence with his friends, before he fell into the hands of his enemies; and though his care to preserve Catholicity in the Church of England was, apparently, made fruitless; the temporary depression of the English reformation, under Mary, not only stopped the possible advance to yet farther deviations, but left time for the revival of Ridley's principles, in a certain degree, from the very accession of Elizabeth, and thenceforth, in an increasing number of susceptible minds, until at length, after another season of depression, from sectarian ascendancy, the spirit of Ridley's doctrine was wonderfully infused into that very form, from which Cranmer had sought to exclude it; and which, considering the yet unsettled state of the public mind, (just after the Restoration,) the revisers thought it safer to re-animate, than to re-modify.

Of this judicious management, our present Communion service is the inestimable result. When I compare it with the original form, I could wish a greater nearness, (though I do not dispute that some questionable matters were prudently omitted;) but, on a comparison with the service, as it stood before the revision, I regard our present service with sincere pleasure; and no little wonder, at the chain of preparatory events, which led to that important result. Had the first Prayer-book of Edward, short-lived as it was, not existed, there would have been no impressive example of a more excellent way; but yet, a recurrencee to that long antiquated form, at once, and in the first instance, might have been less likely to be thought of, and more difficult in practice. Happily, however, it had been already recurred to, in preparing the Prayer book for Scotland, in 1637; and, though the measure failed in its primary purpose, it afforded a most convenient model for the revisers, in 1661, as far as they could follow it with safety. To have done so avowedly, or even observedly, might have raised an outcry, and defeated their whole design; the Scottish Prayer book being regarded, as the immediate source of the civil war. Except in one remarkable instance, which I will notice, they therefore adopted merely the rubrics which the Scottish Prayer-book afforded them. I cannot doubt, that, had they felt themselves at liberty, they would have gone farther, and that the Scottish Communion service would

have been followed throughout; but, as it is, it will be seen, on a comparison of the former service, as it was before the revision, with the service now in use, that, by means of the rubrics, a new character was given to the celebration of the Eucharist, which substantially re-imbued it with the spirit of Bertram, and restored it to the ground, on which it had at first been placed.

The instance in which the revisers did more than merely introduce rubrics, was probably chosen, not only as most urgently requiring a change, but also, as being least likely to awaken captious observation. In other instances, Cranmer had been content to effect his purposes by omissions, (except in his new form of delivering the elements;) but in the place now referred to, namely, in the exhortation giving notice of the Sacrament, he had so palpably displaced the doctrine of Bertram and Ridley, and substituted, in its stead, his own new view of the Eucharist, as to create a necessity for making this formula correspond with the revised service, by altering it after the original, in the first Prayer book of Edward.

In that formulary, the exhortation invited communicants in the following terms: "Wherefore our duty is to come to these holy mysteries, with most hearty thanks to be given to Almighty God, for his infinite mercy and benefits given and bestowed upon us, his unworthy servants, for whom he hath not only given his body to death, but also does vouchsafe, in a sacra-

ment and mystery, to give us his said body and blood to feed upon spiritually."

I need not point out to you how expressly the doctrine of Bertram is recognised, in this last sentence. Where, therefore, that doctrine was to be expunged, the corresponding sentence in the notification of the Sacrament was thus modified: "Our duty is to render to Almighty God, our heavenly Father, most hearty thanks, for that he hath given his Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance, as it is declared unto us, as well by God's word, as by the holy sacraments of his body and blood."

I think you see at once the amount of this alteration. The spiritual blessing is, in these latter words, as solicitously separated from the outward and visible signs, as it had been, in the former words, expressly combined with them; and, to leave no possible room for supposing the Eucharist, a divinely appointed medium of "grace, and heavenly benediction," it is distinctly represented as a mere declaratory symbol. If it could be doubted, on what principle the Communion service was re-constructed by Cranmer, the single sentence now referred to would decide the question.

But observe, I pray you, how emphatically the revisers have restored, what Cranmer had rejected; yet with as much retention as possible of the former language. "Wherefore it is our duty to render most humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God, our hea-

venly Father, for that he hath given his Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance *in* that holy Sacrament."

As Cranmer, then, by his version of this single passage, manifested the principle, which governed all his circumstantial modifications; so, I conceive the revisers, by restoring, and even, in some sort, strengthening, the significant terms, used in the first English Prayer book, have thrown a light not to be mistaken, on all the other particulars, by which our present Communion service is distinguished, from what it was before the revision.

I have dwelt upon the history of the Eucharist in the Church of England, not in compliance with my own predilection, strong as that may be; but because, laying all circumstances together, I impartially consider our Church, as the exclusive providential conservatory, of ancient Catholic faith and ancient Catholic piety. This deep conviction (for I can use no weaker words) would require a volume to do it justice; but I would hope, that even the sketch which I have given, will, in one instance at least, support its probability. That Bertram should have been raised, as it were, to bear such a testimony, at so critical a conjuncture, was very wonderful. That, in the stormy season of the Reformation, when the revulsion from old extremes teemed with so many new extremes, our Ridley should have been led to embrace the temperament

of Bertram, and to embody it in the first Liturgy, was even yet more wonderful. And that, when this transcript of primitive doctrine was swept away by a whelming tide of new notions, and seemed to have perished for ever, the life and substance of it should, after the lapse of more than a century, be so strangely revived and established, (strangely, I say, considering all the predisposing and facilitating circumstances,) is, surely, the most surprising thing of all. The happy result undoubtedly is, that our Church has thus been made, in one most important instance, a faithful exemplar of the purest Christian antiquity; and I trust that, by being such, in a degree and manner peculiar to herself, she will yet, in the good time of Providence, become a rallying point for safe escape, from all religious errors and extravagances, on the one side, and on the other.

Having thus given you my general view of the subject you bring before me, I turn to your quotation from Justin Martyr; who, I conceive, may be much more easily acquitted of holding transubstantiation, than of being unaccountably obscure.

That a literal transubstantiation was not in his thoughts, appears, from his declaring the εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφὴν to be that, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες, κατὰ μεταβολὴν, τρέφονται ἡμῶν.* This acknowledged identity of the aliment

* The food which has been blessed . . . . by means of which our blood and flesh are strengthened in the course of the changes [of assimilation.] Apol. § 66.

which has been consecrated, with that, which, through the natural process of transmutation, becomes the nourishment of our bodies, cannot consist with the notion of the modern Church of Rome, as (no doubt correctly) stated by Bossuet. "La, Foi," says he, "attentive à la parole de Celui, qui fait tout ce qui lui plaît, dans le ciel et dans la terre, ne reconnoit plus ici d'autre substance, que celle qui est désignée par cette même parole; c'est-à-dire, le propre corps, et le propre sang, de Jésus-Christ, auxquels le pain et le vin sont changés; c'est ce qu'on appellee transubstantiation."*

Had the idea conveyed in these words been present to the mind of Justin, he would naturally have chosen some verb, expressive of the miraculous transmutation which he was supposing. But, on the contrary, he uses the substantive verb εἶναι, (to be;) as if simply to state the purpose to which the consecrated aliment served, without intimating any other change, except that of being made spiritually efficacious, δι' εὐχῆς λόγου.† At the same time, I must acknowledge, that it is easier to ascertain what Justin Martyr did not mean, than what he precisely did mean; and I think, with

* Faith, giving heed to the word of Him, who doth whatsoever pleaseth him in heaven and in earth, perceives no longer here any other substance, than that which is designated by that word; namely, the very body, and the very blood, of Jesus Christ, into which the bread and wine have been changed. This is what is meant by the term transubstantiation.

† By means of a prayer, in language which was used by him.

you, that it was a strange method of informing heathens respecting Christianity. This consideration might almost lead to a doubt, whether we have the passage, exactly as Justin left it. I should think it a possible thing, that ancient manuscripts were tampered with, after the fourth Council of Lateran; though, from the mere darkness of the passage, I should rather imagine, that some word, fixing the import of the position, "ἐξείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιήσαντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ αἷμα διδαχθῆναι εἶναι,"* had been omitted by some early transcriber.

Should you find in Irenæus, expressions appearing to favour transubstantiation you will of course, consider, that, except in a few preserved passages, you have him only in a very poor Latin translation. But I presume you will meet other passages, which prove him not to have held any such tenet. For example, the following passage is quoted by L'Arroque: "We preach, in the Eucharist, the communion and unity of the flesh and spirit; for as the bread, which is of the earth, receiving the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but is the Sacrament composed of two things, the one terrestrial, the other celestial; so, also, our bodies are no more corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection." I need hardly say, that I transcribe this quotation from L'Arroque, simply for the sake of its perfect contrariety to the doctrine of

* Have we been taught that [the food which has been blessed] is both the body and blood of Jesus, who was made flesh.

the Church of Rome. Irenæus's notion, of the Sacrament conveying a principle of immortality* to the body, may be right or wrong, (though it was by no means singular, and is quoted with respect, even in the Homily of the Sacrament.) What I rest in, is, the explicit declaration, that the bread, after consecration, though no longer common bread, still retains its terrestrial nature, along with its new celestial property; and I think I may add, that the assertion is expressed so distinctly, as to imply a moral impossibility of Irenæus having ever spoken otherwise.

I cannot, however, omit a very remarkable evidence, in support of the non-existence of transubstantiation, until it was devised by Paschasius, and established in that otherwise ever memorable council. The authority I have to produce, is that of the very respectable Cuthbert Tonstal, the last Roman Catholic Bishop of Durham. A tract written by him, in the reign of Edward VI., *De veritate Corporis et sanguinis Domini in Eucharistiâ*, lies now before me, in which, while I find him maintaining, that all Catholic Christians, from the beginning, believed concerning the Eucharist, "quod vere ibi, et realiter, Corpus Christi continetur,"† I meet an equally express admission, that the modus of our Saviour's presence in that Holy Sacrament, was unfixed, until the

* I am not sure, however, that such is his meaning; but the idea was certainy entertained.

† That the body of Christ is verily and indeed contained therein.

fourth Council of Lateran; insomuch, that Luther's doctrine ("modus quem Lutherus secutus videtur") would, before that period, have been as orthodox as any other. And, accordingly, while he refers (I presume) to that very passage in Justin Martyr, for proof that "nusquam quisquam Catholicus, ad baptismum admissus, dubitavit de præsentia in Eucharistiæ sacramento," he adds, "cæterum quo modo panis, qui ante consecrationem erat communis, ineffabili Spiritus sanctificatione transiret in corpus ejus, veterum doctissimi quique inscrutabile existimaverunt."* That this statement acknowledges transubstantiation to have been yet unthought of, is plain from the very terms; but it is plainer still, from the supposition which Tonstal makes of two other possible measures, even while insisting that, "quia Ecclesia columna est veritatis, firmum ejus omnino observetur judicium;" which two measures he thus expresses: "An satius fuisset curiosis omnibus imposuisse silentium, ne scrutarentur modum quo id fieret, sicut fecerunt prisci illi qui inscrutabilia quærere non tentabant; an vero potius de modo quo id fieret, curiosum quemque suæ relinquere conjecturæ, sicut liberum fuit ante illud conci-

* Never did any member of the Catholic Church, who had been admitted to baptism, doubt the real presence in the sacrament of the Eucharist. * * * But, as touching the manner in which that, which, before consecration, was common bread, was changed, by the unspeakable sanctification of the Spirit, into his body, all the most learned men of Christian antiquity held it to be no subject of lawful inquiry.

lium, modo veritatem corporis et sanguinis Domini in Eucharistia esse fateretur, quæ fuit ab initio ipsi ecclesiæ fides."† This last assertion, and others like it, are no more than what Tonstal must have said and thought; and what is of far greater weight, positions of a similar kind have been admitted, in a sound sense, even by our wise and temperate Ridley. But whatever we may think of such expressions, as understood by Tonstal, I conceive his admissions are weighty and decisive. The acknowledgment, that there was unrestrained freedom of opinion, respecting the mode of our Saviour's presence in the Eucharist, until that same council; and that then, and not before, the definite doctrine of Transubstatiation was authoritatively imposed upon all, is an express avowal of innovation; and, by consequence, a direct and conclusive testimony, to the simpler and purer belief of the ancient Church.

I must now leave you to ascertain for yourself, what precisely that belief was; my limited reading

† * * * because the Church is the Pillar of Truth, heed ought, by all means, to be given to her decided judgment. * * * Whether it had been better to have enjoined silence on all curious people, so that they should not examine the mode in which the change took place, after the example of those primitive men, who did not attempt to investigate matters which were above their examination: or, to leave every curious man to his own conjecture, as to the mode, according to the freedom which had existed before that council, so that he did but acknowledge the verity of the body and blood of the Lord in the Eucharist, which was the belief of the Church from the beginning.

admitting only, of an endeavour to show you, what it was not. I cannot however conclude, without giving two extracts, one from Dr. Thomas Jackson, the other from Bishop Overall, both divines of the first eminence in their day; that you may have it in your power to judge, whether the ancient fathers say anything substantially different, from what those judicious and sober minded men considered to be the doctrine of the Church of England.

"When we say," says Dr. Jackson, "that Christ is really present in the sacrament, our meaning is, that, as God, he is present, in an extraordinary manner; after such a manner as he was present (before his incarnation) in his sanctuary, the ark of his covenant; and by the power of his Godhead, thus extraordinarily present, he diffuseth the virtue or operation of his human nature, for the vivification of those who" (he means, rightly) "receive the sacramental pledges."

Dr. Overall was Regius Professor in the University of Cambridge; and having, in some public disputation, so expressed himself, respecting the Eucharist, as to excite jealousy in the minds of his puritanical hearers, he thought it necessary explicitly to declare what he believed on the subject. His words are as follow:—

"In Sacramento Eucharistiæ, sive Cœna Dominica, Christi Corpus et Sanguinem, totumque adeo Christum vere quidem adesse; et vere a nobis participari,

vereque conjungi cum signis sacramentalibus, ut cum signis non solum significativis, sed etiam exhibitivis; ita ut in recte dato et accepto pane, detur et accipiatur Corpus Christi; dato et accepto vino detur et accipiatur Sanguis Christi, totusque adeo Christus in sacramenti communione communicetur."† Probably, had Overall lived before the tenth century, he would have thought he had sufficiently stated his belief, in the above expressions; but placed as he was in other circumstances, it was expedient for him, not only to maintain ancient truth, but to protest against erroneous innovation: he therefore added these words:—

"Sed non modo corporali, crasso, terreno; per transubstantiationem, vel consubstantiationem, similiave rationis humanæ commenta, sed modo mystico, cœlesti, ac spirituali, ut recte in articulis nostris præscriptum est."‡

I have not adverted to your candid admission (which I need not tell you gave me very real plea-

† * * * that in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, or the Lord's Supper, the body and blood of Christ, and therefore the whole of Christ, is verily and indeed present, and is verily partaken by us, and verily combined with the sacramental signs, as being not only significative, but exhibitory; so that in the bread duly given and received, the body of Christ is given and received, in the wine given and received, the blood of Christ is given and received; and thus there is a communion of the whole of Christ, in the communion of the sacrament.

‡ Yet not in any bodily, gross, earthly manner, as by transubstantiation, or consubstantiation, or any like devices of human reason, but in a mystical, heavenly, and spiritual manner, as is rightly laid down in our articles.

sure) that Justin Martyr's expressions, and those of other Fathers, appear to support my view of the sacrament. Such certainly, has been my own deep persuasion; and you have now some of the grounds on which that persuasion has rested. In the little treatise, however, I did not think it prudent to introduce a subject, of which I could not have made use, without greatly enlarging my plan. I therefore deemed it best, not to look beyond the Church of England; reserving the other subject for a preliminary discourse in the event of actual publication. After all, I assure you, I could not have written with satisfaction to myself, if I had not been convinced, that, on the point in question, the Church of England, and the Fathers, were faithful followers, and true expositors, of our blessed Saviour, and of St. Paul.

Ever yours,

ALEX. KNOX.

July 19, 1826.

TREATISE ON THE USE AND IMPORT OF THE EUCHARISTIC SYMBOLS.

As the great body of Christians, who, three centuries ago, rejected the Romish yoke, differ generally from the Church of Rome on the subject of the Eucharist, so do they also, among themselves, maintain certain specific differences, respecting the design and import of that sacred institution.

The principal point of controversy appears to turn upon this question:—*Is the blessing, to be expected in the Eucharist by qualified receivers, a mere communication of the ordinary grace of God, obtained in the same purely inward and mental manner, as in other exercises of devotion;*—or, *is there, in this holy sacrament, a peculiar effluence of supernatural grace, mysteriously united with the consecrated symbols, so as to make them the vehicles of heavenly benediction to the capable communicant?*

The maintainers of the former of these views, have, doubtless, explained themselves, with much verbal difference; and, in the earlier times of the Refor-

mation, with not a little obscurity. But their great point of agreement seems to have consisted, in their separating the sacramental blessing, in whatever manner they defined it, from the sacramental symbols; and regarding the spiritual part of the transaction, as exclusively within the mind of the receiver.

Of this way of thinking were, most probably, all the Helvetic Reformers. Calvin, though accustomed to use strong language respecting the Eucharist, must still be understood to have connected the grace of the Eucharist with the commemorating act, but in no manner with the symbols. And Bucer, who was invited into England, in the reign of Edward VI., to give counsel in farther changes which were meditated in the lately established English Liturgy, was clearly and zealously of the same opinion.

Our justly celebrated Ridley, in his rejection of Roman Catholic excesses, had been led to take a different view, and, no less clearly, to connect the grace communicated in the Eucharist with the received symbols. His influence, there is reason to believe, had predominated, in the first reformation of the Liturgy; inasmuch as, in every part of the Communion Service, the idea of a blessing, strictly through the consecrated elements, is impressively conveyed. But, by the advice of Bucer, the first service, after a year or two, was re-modified; and the idea of combination of grace with the symbols, had not, in the former service, been more carefully

intimated, than it appeared afterward to be studiously excluded.*

In this alteration, Ridley obviously could not concur, though conscientious prudence restrained him from actual opposition. Most probably, it was with particular reference to this very matter, that he acknowledged, in a letter to a former chaplain, written during his confinement, that, in the recent times, it "had chanced him to mislike some things; for," he adds, "sudden changes, without substantial and necessary cause, and the heady setting forth of extremities, I did never love."† Besides, in the very last period of his life, he declared his own belief, that, in the Eucharist, "what was before common bread, is now made a lively representation of Christ's body; and that it is not only a figure, but effectuously representeth his body: such a sacramental mutation," he says, "I grant to be in the bread and wine; which, truly, is no small change; but such a change, as no mortal man can make, but only the omnipotency of Christ's word."‡

* And yet, after all, the exclusion was not complete. Probably Cranmer did not wish to carry his changes as far, as would have been necessary for this purpose. The original doctrine, therefore, still remained, by the most obvious implication, in the commencing sentences of the exhortation, "Dearly beloved in the Lord," &c. in which Ridley's view of the Holy Eucharist appears to be conveyed, if not as expressly, yet as substantially, and with as much simple sublimity, as it could be in human language.

† Ridley's Life of Ridley, p. 578.

‡ Wordsworth, vol. iii. p. 237. Ridley's Life of Ridley, p. 20.

But it is remarkable, that, notwithstanding the change in the Communion Service, those passages of the lately formed Articles, in which the old doctrine was substantially conveyed, still remained unaltered. Undoubtedly it would have been expunged in every instance, had divine Providence allowed time for the accomplishment of all that was then meditated. But whatever were the intentions of Cranmer, they were speedily made abortive, by the death of Edward VI.

It must be observed, however, that the changes in the Communion Service, made at the suggestion of Bucer, implied the omission of the former doctrine, rather than the substitution of an opposite doctrine in its stead. The only direct intimation of Bucer's theory, was given in the altered form of delivering the symbols. In the first English Service, the two commencing sentences of the present forms, stood alone; in the altered service, the two present latter sentences stood alone, as substitutes for the two former. On the accession of Elizabeth, however, the two original sentences were restored; but prefixed to the two latter, as we still have them. Thus in a certain degree, the doctrine of Ridley was again recognized, inasmuch as it is clearly intimated in the replaced words, which must have been restored for the very sake of that intimation; while the subjoined words, which conveyed an opposite sense as substitutes, cannot be thus understood, when merely an ad-

dition. They express a truth, but not the whole truth. When they stood as substitutes, they appeared to convey the *only* true notion, and especially to exclude that idea, which the former words had suggested.

This reinstatement of the significant words, which, for so many ages, had been used in the Christian Church, had (together with the unaltered Articles already adverted to) a stronger influence on the minds of the succeeding English Clergy, in favour of Ridley's doctrine, than its studied omission, in the rest of the Communion Service, could have against it. Various evidences of this fact might be adduced; but the most conclusive proof is afforded by the prayer Book for the Scottish Church, in the year 1637.*

* Perhaps the most important alteration made in the second liturgy of Edward VI. was the omission of part of the prayer of consecration in the communion service. It was as stated in the text, adopted in the Scottish Liturgy, from which it has been in substance, transferred to the American. It has been inserted below, so much as is in brackets is in the English Liturgy, in the form of a thanks-giving, to be used in the discretion of the Priest instead of the thanksgiving after receiving, which preserves its place in the American Liturgy. The former parts called the Oblation and Invocation are not in the English Liturgy.

"*The Oblation.* Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we, thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, which we now offer unto thee, the memorial thy Son hath commanded us to make; having in remembrance his blessed passion and precious death, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks, for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same."

In the Communion Service of that formulary, the first Prayer Book of King Edward was substantially followed, and Ridley's doctrine, in consequence, avowedly maintained. Had that measure succeeded in Scotland, there can be little doubt, that a like recurrence to the earlier principles of our Reformation would have taken place in England. But every such project was frustrated, and the entire design defeated, by the civil war which so speedily ensued. The Scottish Service Book, however, had its eventual use,

"*The Invocation.* And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and of thy Almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his Death and Passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood. [And we earnestly desire thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we, and all thy whole Church, may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee; humbly beseeching thee, that we, and all others who shall be partakers of this holy Communion, may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus Christ, be filled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with him, that he may dwell in them, and they in him. And although we are unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences; through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. *Amen.*"]

in affording material guidance to the revisers of the English Prayer Book, after the Restoration. The object, then, evidently was, to re-infuse the spirit of Ridley's doctrine, into the Communion Service. But political reasons required this purpose to be effected, not avowedly, but by significant intimations; that is, by Rubrics, enjoining certain things to be done, which had not been directed in the unrevised form; but which, being now deliberately introduced after so long an omission, had a far greater force, than if they had remained from the beginning; while, on an attentive, and still more, on a comparative examination of them, their meaning will appear irresistible. Thus, without adding one word to the service itself, (a restraint which we may believe they would gladly not have felt, as their following the Scottish Prayer Book so much, bespeaks a wish to have followed it still more completely,) the revisers effected a kind of revolution in our Communion Service, which, quiet as it was, has probably been as deep in its operation, on the feelings of the devout, as it will be found decisive in its import, to the intelligent mind.

I have stated these particulars, as tending to illustrate the ground, on which, I ascribe the doctrine of Ridley to the existing Church of England; but to evince this fact more fully, it will be necessary to adduce the instances already alluded to, in which the original view of the Reformed Church of England had remained unaltered.

The 25th Article of the Church treats expressly "of the Sacraments;" and it declares them, to "be not only badges, or tokens, of Christian men's profession, but rather certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and of God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but strengthen and confirm our faith in him."

I conceive Ridley's doctrine of the Eucharist could scarcely be expressed, with greater simplicity or strength, than in these words. The Sacraments are said to be *effectual signs of grace*, for this reason, *because, by them, God works invisibly in us;* that is, the visible signs are the means, or instruments, by which God performs his invisible work on our minds and hearts. There is an import in the expression, *works invisibly*, which deserves attention. It implies, that the divine operation, through the visible signs, is not the less real or direct, because imperceptible to our bodily senses. An explanation of this mysterious transaction, is, of course, not attempted; but the instrumentality of the visible signs is, evidently, made the very essence of a Sacrament.

In the 28th Article, which treats specially of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, are the following words: "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner." This position was, no doubt, made in contradiction to the gross doctrine of a literal

transubstatiation; but it rejects that error, not by a mere negation, but by also laying down the strict truth of the case. "The body of Christ," is not said, in a general way, to be *received*, but to be *given*, *taken*, and *eaten*; as if there was a solicitude, in correcting the abuses of the Sacrament, explicitly to maintain the union, between the heavenly and spiritual blessing, and the outward and visible sign. *This*, is *given* by the minister, and *taken* by the communicant. To use these precise expressions, therefore, respecting "the body of Christ," is, by clearest implication, to combine that "heavenly and spiritual" blessing, with the *given* and *taken* symbol.

The same notion will be found equally recognised, in the 29th Article: "Of the wicked, which eat not the body of Christ, in the use of the Lord's Supper."

"The wicked," says the Article, "and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth, (as St. Augustine saith,) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ; but rather to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign, and sacrament, of so great a thing."

It need not be shown, how superfluous and inapposite the terms of this negation would be, if no conjunction, of the spiritual blessing with the visible signs, had been contemplated. It is the idea of such a conjunction only, which could make it necessary to assert, that, although the wicked pressed the Sacra-

ment visibly with their teeth, they, nevertheless, did not partake of the invisible blessing. But, in truth, to apply the term *Sacrament*, to the visible sign, to give that denomination to the consecrated symbols, rather than to the act of commemorating or communicating, would intimate, if even nothing more were said, that those visible symbols were regarded, as the divinely constituted means, or vehicles, of the invisible blessing.

When such definite expressions of doctrine, as have now been adduced, had been, through divine Providence, preserved unaltered, it is not extraordinary, that the views of Ridley should have still remained prevalent, notwithstanding the omission of them in the Communion Service. It seems, in fact, that they gained strength through time; as, in the reign of James I., it was thought expedient to introduce them into the catechetical instruction of children.

In the addition then made to the Catechism, a Sacrament is defined, as an "outward and visible sign, of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us; ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof." The outward and visible sign, in the Lord's Supper, is stated to be "bread and wine, which the Lord has commanded to be received;" and the inward part, or thing signified, is "the body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful," in that Sacrament.

Here it is, in the first place, distinctly taught, that the outward and visible sign in a Sacrament, is the means whereby we receive the inward and spiritual grace; and we are to observe, that the term *inward* does not, in this instance, mark a quality of that grace, as operating in us, (however, in that sense also, justly applicable,) but as existing, in some mysterious manner, in the Sacrament itself; for it is of *this*, that the spiritual grace is declared to be the "*inward part;*" evidently implying, that, through the divine power, the visible signs become, for our spiritual benefit, supernaturally endued with invisible virtue.

This virtue, in the Lord's Supper, is declared to be, "the body and blood of Christ;" that is, in the sublime and heavenly sense, in which our Saviour himself speaks of his flesh and blood, in the 6th chapter of St. John. These are said to be, "verily and indeed taken and received," by all faithful communicants. The strength of this language has been universally felt; and, to some, it has appeared ambiguous. But it should always be kept in view, that the mysterious matter, thus spoken of, had already been described, as an "inward and *spiritual* grace;" and was, therefore, to be understood no otherwise, than in that spiritual manner, of which our Lord himself has given the example. But it was thought right, expressly to notify, that this divine communication, by being *spiritual*, was not on that account

the less *real*; that, in fact, it was a *substantive communication* from the adorable person of our Redeemer, quickening us with his divine vitality, strengthening us with his strength, and enriching us, in proportion to our faithfulness, with all the graces which were in him.

And as such solicitude was felt to assert the divine nature and potency of this heavenly grace, so was there no less attention to omit nothing, which might impress its combination with the symbols. "The body and blood of Christ," therefore, are declared to be "*taken*," as well as "received, by the faithful." The latter word would have been sufficient, had it been intended to leave at large the manner of communication. The former word consequently was used for the very purpose of suggesting that manner; for (as was remarked on the 28th Article) the word "*taken*," clearly refers to the "given" symbol, and thus intimates the mysterious connexion, between the visible signs, and the invisible blessing.

I have adduced and remarked upon the above passages, in the authoritative forms of our Church, not only from due respect to their weight, but because I thought I could not better elucidate the matter in discussion, than by endeavouring to explain the views of the Church of England concerning it. I add nothing to what I have already remarked, respecting the modifications of the Communion Service, effected by the revisers, in 1661; because their insertions could nei-

ther be appreciated, nor clearly understood, except by comparing the service, as it had stood before, with the revised form.

I have also dwelt more particularly on the evidences of what our Church maintains on this subject, because, during the last hundred years, another view has been taken; even by some, who supported the general idea, of grace concurring in the sacramental act, against Bishop Hoadley and his followers; and who were accounted, in other respects, champions of orthodoxy.

The most conspicuous of this class, was the celebrated Dr. Waterland; who, in his work on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper,* while he zealously argues for grace from heaven, as concomitant to the act, seems little less anxious to repel the notion of any mysterious connexion of that grace, with the symbols. It is remarkable, that he takes Cranmer, as, on this point, the genuine interpreter of the Church of England; and, though Ridley's very different sentiments must have been well known to him, he passes them over in a sort of shuffling manner, as if he did not like to meddle with them. The characteristic coldness of Waterland, might very naturally have made him prefer the more general and indefinite notion; but knowingly to keep back the judgment of such a man as Ridley, was not doing complete justice, either to the subject, or to the reader.

* P. 257.

A still later writer, of at least equal weight and celebrity (Bishop Horsley,) may, however, be adduced, as strictly agreeing with Ridley. In one of his charges to the clergy of Rochester, we find the following passage: "But the frequency of the celebration will be of little use, unless your people are well instructed, in the nature, and use, of this most holy and mysterious ordinance. If they are suffered to consider it as nothing more, than a rite of simple commemoration of Christ's death, a mere external form of thanksgiving on the part of the receiver, they will never come to it with due reverence. You will instruct them, therefore, in the true notion of a sacrament; that the sacraments are not only signs of grace, but means of the grace signified, the *matter of the sacrament* being by Christ's appointment, and the operation of the Holy Spirit, *the vehicle of grace* to the believer's soul."

But, however clearly the Church of England, and her most celebrated divines, way have spoken, it will still be asked, whether the doctrine itself can be shown to correspond, with the analogy of the divine proceedings, and to be supported by the language of the holy scripture?

The question, respecting the correspondence of this doctrine with the general analogy of the divine proceedings, must be answered by referring, first, to the most signal exercises of divine power, for man's bene-

fit, in the Old Testament; and, next, to such instances of the divine conduct, in the New Testament, as may be fairly thought to accord, in their general nature, with the case in question.

With respect to the Old Testament, I believe it may be asserted, that wherever a divine benefit, or blessing, whether to individuals, or to the whole people, was of such a nature, as suitably to admit the intervention of a sensible instrument, or medium,—something bearing that character, in itself, perhaps, of the humblest nature, was almost uniformly employed. To particularise the various instances would be to transcribe a large portion of the sacred history. It may be sufficient to adduce some of the most striking examples.

It is, in the first place, worthy of remark, that, in this precise way, even innocent man in Paradise, was to enjoy the blessing of immortality. Instead of possessing this privilege as an inherent property, he was to derive its continuance from eating the fruit of a particular tree; and, accordingly, when, through disobedience, the threatened mortality was incurred, the sentence was executed by an exclusion from that tree. It must not be omitted, that, from the earliest ages of the Christian Church, it has been usual to regard the tree of life, in Eden, as a significant type of the eucharist; and in admitting this correspondence, the idea of a similar mysterious efficacy, in the

eucharistical symbols, for sustaining spiritual life and immortality, was naturally, if not necessarily, implied.

At a subsequent period, when, in the great progressive scheme of divine beneficence, Moses was commissioned to work miracles, he was not directed to perform them merely by a word. The shepherd's rod, which, at the moment of the divine call, he had in his hand, was from thence to be, not only the ensign, but the instrument of the power, with which he was endued. "Thou shalt take this rod," said Jehovah, "in thy hand, wherewith thou shalt do signs." We accordingly find it afterwards denominated, *the rod of God;* and the numerous instances in which it was used, are so many exemplifications, of omnipotence acting through a material medium. There was a profound fitness in this mode of proceeding, else it would not have been adopted. It obviously gave a palpability to the divine interposition, which accommodated it, with peculiar aptitude, to the complex nature of man; while the simplicity of the means, evinced the unseen agency, by which the effect was accomplished.

We may also observe, that not only where miraculous acts were to be performed, but even where settled purposes were to be notified, and habitual impressions produced, sensible expedients were equally employed. Thus, to give sustenance, through the bodily senses, to the faith and devotion of the heart, the pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night, accompanied

the children of Israel through the wilderness; and thus, when that miraculous token of the divine presence ceased to appear, the ark of the covenant, to which it had been used to attach itself, and which was thereby sealed as the perpetual symbol of God's special residence, became the point of inexpressible attraction to every true Israelite, as the place where God was infallibly to be found, and from whence mercy and goodness were sure to flow forth, upon every faithful worshipper.

The depth of this feeling might be illustrated by numerous examples. The care which God was pleased to take for its confirmation and continuance, at the consecration of Solomon's temple, by the reappearance of the same divine cloud, attaching itself to the same ark, in proof that the same presence would reside in the new mansion, unspeakably evinced the value of such a support to faith, and such an excitement to devotion. Its actual influence, on minds the most capable of appreciating it, is manifested in the case of Daniel; who so venerated and loved, even the desolated spot which had been thus distinguished, that, in defiance of the king of Babylon's edict, he persevered in praying, as he had been wont, three times a day, "his windows being open, in his chamber, toward Jerusalem."

It will hardly be said, that the eyes of pious Israelites were directed to the ark, as the pledge and symbol of providential, rather than of strictly

spiritual, blessings. An expectation of these latter is continually expressed, in the devotional language of the Old Testament; and it is every where evident, that, in the inmost concerns of the heart, access to God was facilitated, reliance on God strengthened, and fixedness and concentration of mind secured and heightened, by the settled assurance of his specially present Majesty.

But it particularly pertains to the main question to remark, that amongst extraordinary effects produced in the Old Testament times, through material instruments, those of a strictly mental and spiritual nature are not wholly wanting. One instance, at least, of this kind, is found, in the impression on the mind of Elisha, through the touch of Elijah's mantle. Elijah had been directed, to appoint Elisha his successor in the prophetic office. It may therefore be concluded, that the general dispositions of the latter fitted him for such a distinction; but he himself seems, at the moment, to have had no apprehension of what awaited him, as he was busily occupied in agricultural labour; but as soon as Elijah cast his mantle upon him, he is drawn, as if by irresistible attraction; and only wishes to have time for bidding his father's house farewell; the prophet, probably, had been led to throw his mantle by a special impulse, and scarcely foresaw the fulness of the result; for he answers, as if in some surprise, "Go back again, for what have I done unto thee?" But it is remarkable, that that

very mantle becomes, again, the pledge and symbol of divine blessing to Elisha. He had asked, that a double portion of his master's spirit should rest upon him; and the fall of Elijah's mantle, while the prophet himself was carried up to heaven, appears to have been regarded, by Elisha, as notifying the success of his petition. In addition to what he himself had felt, he had seen Elijah divide the waters of Jordan, by smiting them with that very mantle; and as if to satisfy himself, that in possessing the visible pledge, he possessed also the mysterious power, we see him smiting the same waters with the same mantle, with the solemn and successful appeal,—"Where is the Lord God of Elijah?"

Were the above instances to be contemplated by themselves, it might perhaps be thought that such accommodation to man's animal nature, belonged rather to the Jewish dispensation, than to the spirituality of the Gospel. But this notion woul be disproved at once, by the slightest attention to the actual conduct, both of our Lord, and his Apostles.

It was right, and, perhaps, necessary, that when the Word was made flesh, and tabernacled among men, he should manifest his divine prerogative, of simply commanding nature, and being instantly obeyed. He accordingly, on some occasions, merely spoke, and the effect immediately followed. Thus, he healed the centurion's servant, and the nobleman's

son, who was sick at Capernaum. Thus, he stilled the tempest; and thus, also, he raised Lazarus from the tomb. But, ordinarily, he was pleased to act otherwise. He made use of some visible sign; and often transmitted the divine virtue, which dwelt in him, through a material medium. He laid his hands on those who applied; or he permitted them to touch "the hem of his garment, and as many as touched him were made perfectly whole." Once, he touched the tongue of a dumb man with his spittle. At another time, he made clay by spitting on the ground, and put it on the eyes of a blind man, whom he sent (for the obvious purpose of notoriety) to wash it off in the pool of Siloam.

Nor was it only where corporeal blessings were conveyed, that our Lord was pleased to use a visible sign. When children were brought to him, not to be healed, but simply to receive his divine benediction, we read, that he laid his hands upon them. And in that most signal instance, when, after his resurrection, he solemnly established his Apostles in their exalted office, we are told, that "he breathed on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

With reference to the particular subject under consideration, this last instance appears worthy of peculiar attention. The period of types and shadows was now clearly over, and the dispensation of "Grace and Truth" had substantially begun. We may humbly conclude, therefore, that our Lord would do nothing

at this time, which was not strictly congenial with all that was to follow. Yet, at this moment of immutable precedent, he employs the same method of impressive accommodation to man's animal nature. In an instance the most important and vital, he communicates inward and spiritual grace, through an outward sign, and a corporeal medium. His breath, as man, is made the vehicle of that Spirit, which, even as man, he had possessed without measure. It was the last and best blessing which his Apostles were to receive, from his bodily presence; and may be justly regarded as their first strict and proper animation, with the inward and spiritual life; the first fulfilment of that promise, so lately made to them respecting the divine Paraclete, "He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." Here, therefore (it would seem,) no less really than on the day of Pentecost, the words of his forerunner were verified, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." On that day they received new powers: the fire which our Lord came to send upon the earth, was then *visibly* kindled; but it was at that former time, when our Lord "breathed upon them," and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," that they really became *new creatures;* for how else shall we account for those clearer apprehensions of the new dispensation, which their choice of a successor to Judas, and their deep and unremitting intensity in prayer, prove them to have possessed, previously to their last signal endowment, "with power from on high?"

I have enlarged on that remarkable act of our Redeemer, in his final intercourse with his Apostles on earth, not merely because it may be thought in the highest degree pertinent to my present subject, but because its powerful influence, as manifested in so immediate a change of character has, as far as I know, been, hitherto, not sufficiently adverted to.

That the Apostles, from this and other divine evidences, were, in their own minds, impressed with the suitable transmission of inward and spiritual blessings, through outward and visible signs, appears from their own subsequent practice. As their divine Master, in breathing on them, had made them partakers of that Spirit, which was in him; so, when it became their part, as his ministers, to communicate, in measure, the same heavenly gift to others, they conferred this blessing, by the imposition of their hands: and it is expressly testified, that "through the laying on of the Apostles' hands, the Holy Ghost was given."

It is remarkable, that this practice of the Apostles is stated, without any explanatory observation; obviously, because such a proceeding, however wonderful in itself, was in such complete accordance with all of a like nature which had been done formerly, that there was no more room, before-hand, for questioning its fitness, than there was possibility, afterward, of disputing its efficacy.

Enough being now said, in the way of preliminary remark, it may be proper, in considering the subject

itself, to begin with this natural question,—In what light were our Lord's Apostles most likely to contemplate the institution of the holy Eucharist, under all the impressions which we must suppose to have possessed their minds?

Our Lord's discourse, in the 6th chapter of St. John, could not but be present to their thoughts; for the Holy Spirit was to bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever had been said unto them. Those deeply significant words, "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me;" these words, I say, could not but associate themselves, in the minds of the Apostles, with the strictly corresponding language, used at the institution of the eucharistic Sacrament; and it would be not merely natural, but inevitable for them to explain our Lord's words on the one occasion, by what he had so emphatically spoken on the other.

In that memorable discourse, he had clearly intimated, that his death was to make provision for that divine nutriment, which he was to furnish from himself. "The bread from heaven," said he, "is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." When, therefore, just before his entrance on the great concluding scene, he took bread, and having blessed and broken it, gave it to his disciples, saying, "Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you," it was

impossible not to connect these words, and this act, with the corresponding expressions uttered at Capernaum. When they saw that last Paschal supper (in itself a type of the Redeemer) formed into a new ordinance, in which the acts of eating and drinking were to have an import and the aliments fed upon to bear a denomination, identical with the terms of that former announcemennt; what could be their conclusion, but that not only the ordinance generally, but the specific acts and aliments so distinguished were to be instrumentally conducive to that divine benefit, with which they were thus intimately conjoined?

I must venture to add, that, in proportion to their high apprehensions of the blessings to be conferred, the more disposed would they be to recognise the entire fitness of such means of conveyance. It has been seen, that their minds were habituated to the transmission of such influences, as were strictly supernatural and heavenly, through sensible and material vehicles. But what influence could they have conceived, more supernatural, or more heavenly, than such a communication of himself, as their divine Master had warranted them to expect? The terms in which that assurance had been given, were so definite, so distinctive, and so reiterated, as to require an adequate construction, and to convey a substantive idea; and our Lord, after using them, was pleased, emphatically, to attest their high and holy import, by

declaring, "the words which I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life."

The promise, therefore, of our Lord's flesh and blood to be to them meat indeed, and drink indeed, to be the spiritual and eternal life of their souls, by virtue of which he should dwell in them and they in him, and they should live by him as he lived by the Father,—this promise, I say, could not, consistently with the terms in which it is expressed, be understood to mean any thing less, than an inconceivable, but most real, emanation from his divine person, in which there would be the same exercise of his divine power, for the animation and sustenance of the soul, as when divine virtue had gone out of him, for the healing of the body. I conceive, they could have given no other interpretation than this to our Lord's prospective assurances. In the appointment, therefore, of visible symbols, to be instrumentally effective in conveying the promised blessing, they would see nothing, but that which, according to all their experience, was suitable and proportionate. They would, moreover, perceive, that a twofold communication, the flesh and blood of the Redeemer, was provided for by a twofold medium; the lowliness of which evinced only the more, the power of the invisible agent; while, in such an operation, it would not appear unfitting, that bread, the prime nourishment of human life, and wine, the prime cherisher of human weakness, should be the material instruments of this heavenly purpose.

I do not mean to say, that such thoughts were likely to have occurred, at that hour, when the sacrament of the Eucharist was first instituted. At no time were the Apostles less competent to have discovered the weighty import of our Lord's expressions. Probably, in the depth of that sorrow which had filled their hearts, they did not recollect the particular discourse, by which alone his language could have been fully explained. But afterwards, when the promise was fulfilled, that all things which they had heard should be brought to their remembrance, the connexion, between the discourse at Capernaum, and the eucharistic institution, would impress itself on them, in all its clearness and importance; and may it not be presumed, that the more they considered the subject, the greater reason would they perceive, for acknowledging the divine goodness and wisdom, not only in the transcendent nature of the blessing thus entailed upon the Church, but also in the choice of such an appropriate provision, for its stated and perpetual communication?

It would be obvious to them, that if the sacrament of the Eucharist had been ordained, merely as a commemorative celebration,—that is, if our Redeemer had said nothing more, than "Do this in remembrance of me,"—its institution would have implied rather the injunction of a permanent duty, than the pledge and means of a permanent blessing. In that view, it might have afforded an occasion for the solemn

expression of Christian gratitude, or the renewal of Christian obligation; but it could not be thought to give the prospect of any special spiritual benefit, beyond what might be found, in an equally ardent exercise of devotion, on any other religious occasion. The ordinary grace of God might have been relied upon, for co-operation, in such an effort of the mind, to think more closely on the love of their dying Lord, or to feel it more deeply; but, as it should seem, only as equal efforts would be assisted, in the common acts of pious supplication. Yet still, on this ground, it might not have been easy to account satisfactorily, for introducing, into a simple commemoration, any outward or visible part. The merely natural effect of the eucharistic signs, on the external senses, would hardly explain their adoption in a religion, in which rites and ceremonies were so professedly to give place to spiritual worship; and it would be still more difficult to conceive, how the eating and drinking of those visible symbols should be an essential co-ingredient, in the exercise of a purely commemorative devotion.

But, in ascribing to the eucharistic symbols the instrumental effectiveness, with which the significant word of their divine Master had appeared to invest them, the Apostles would see, in that institution, a provision for their spiritual consolation and benefit, in which all their pre-existing habits of mind were consulted, and all their mental and moral exigencies richly supplied. The nature of the eucharistic sacra-

ment was clearly such, as to have in it no other virtue, than what flowed into it from Him, by whom it was instituted. The eating of bread, and drinking of wine, had, in itself, neither conduciveness, nor any obvious congeniality, to a spiritual purpose. It could, therefore, have only that precise import, which our Redeemer was pleased to give to it, namely, that it was a visible method, appointed by him, of spiritually eating his flesh, and spiritually drinking his blood; and that it must accordingly derive its spiritual efficacy, from the concomitancy of his omnipotent power. The Eucharist, when thus regarded, would be, to the disciples of our Lord, such a pledge as was given them in no other instance, of their living by his life, being strong through his strength, and growing in grace, by a vital effluence from himself.

The means otherwise afforded them, of building themselves up in their most holy faith, they would, doubtless, value and improve. But, in this superadded provision, there was a source of satisfaction peculiar to itself. In all other exercises of religion, the mind was to contribute its own exertions; and, though subordinately, yet directly, to minister to its own benefit or comfort. In the eucharistic institution alone, human co-operation could have no share in the effect; because the medium employed could communicate influence or blessing, only through the direct operation of Almighty Power. It was not to be questioned, that in every instance in which spiritual bene-

fit was conferred, the goodness of God was to be regarded as its supreme source. But, where the rational powers of man intervened, whether those of the recipient himself, or of any human helper of his faith, the sensible advantage would seem, more or less, to resemble the blessings of nature and providence, which are apparently the result of general laws. It might, therefore, have appeared as reasonable, as it was gracious, that, for the perpetual comfort and assurance of the church, in the highest and noblest instance in which divine blessing was to be conferred, the supreme source of that blessing should condescend to be its direct and immediate dispenser; and should prove himself to be such, by employing means of communication, which, venerable and impressive as they should become, by being made, not merely the instruments of his power, but the effectual representatives of himself,* would be not only weak, but fruitless, in any other hands than his own.

If we may believe these views to have presented themselves to the minds of the Apostles, we must also suppose them to have been heightened in their effect, as far as that was possible, by the pre-existing habits already adverted to.

It must be remembered, that the Jewish religion was not wholly typical; on the contrary, it contained much, which was naturally and intrinsically attractive and endearing. Above all, the special presence of

* "He that eateth *me*, even he shall live by me."—*John*, vi. 57.

God in his holy temple, held a place in the mind of every pious Jew, for which nothing but a full equivalent could compensate. We are to observe, that there was nothing in that presence, except the limitation to one exclusive spot, which savoured of an imperfect dispensation. It was not to the infancy of human nature, but to human nature itself, that this instance of divine condescension was engaging. That presence had, indeed, for ages, been as much a matter of faith, as the glory of God in heaven; but it was not the less apprehended, as an invaluable and delightful reality. This it was, which made the Mount Sion attractive, to every devout Israelite; which induced the inspired Anna not to depart from the temple; which detained the child Jesus, when Mary and Joseph had departed from Jerusalem;* and which afterward roused his holy zeal to an intensity, never manifested on any other occasion.

Had nothing parallel to that grace and glory of the Old dispensation, been retained in the New, a want might have been felt, which all its other benefits would not have supplied; but, in the Eucharist as seen in the light of our blessed Saviour's words, there was the imperishable pledge of an equally glorious, but far more gracious presence; a presence, not confined to a single spot, but to be realised, in our Lord's

* It would seem that our Lord's answer to his mother and Joseph, St. Luke, ii. 19., might most fitly be rendered, "Why is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be in the house of my Father?"

appointed way, wherever his word should be received, and his church established; a presence, not merely to be approached with confidence of being heard, and mercifully regarded, but with which, an incomparably nearer communion was to be vouchsafed, and from which, an inexpressibly more efficacious influence was to be communicated, than, in the former dispensation, could even have been conceived.

All, therefore, and far more than all, that the ark of the covenant had been to pious Israelites, the sacrament of the Eucharist must, on the grounds which have been stated, have appeared to the Apostles, and their initiated disciples. Our Lord's assurance to them, in general terms, had been, "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world;" and a still more consolatory promise had been given,—"Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." The eucharistic institution, understood as has been stated, would necessarily imply the most substantial fulfilment of those comprehensive declarations. However otherwise the great head of the church should be present with his members, he must then be specially present with them, when he gave them spiritual life and nourishment from himself.

In the very idea of such a communication, there was something so sublime and heavenly, that the more it was dwelt upon, the more it would fill the mind with all the impressive results to which it led.

And it might not be too much to say, that the pillar of cloud, or of fire, could not have been, to the senses of the Israelites, a surer token of the special presence of Jehovah, than the consecrated symbols in the Eucharist were, to the minds of the Apostles and their fellow Christians, of an equally special, and much more endearing and effective presence of the incarnate Word. In this ordinance, they would see a mercy-seat as sensibly established, as in the former dispensation, but with far nobler hopes, and better promises; and in the light of our Lord's infallible words, it would place before their mental eye a Shechinah, as real as that which had visibly possessed itself of the holy of holies, at the dedication of Solomon's temple. In witnessing our Lord's institution of the Eucharist, and his divinely significant consecration of its symbols, they had seen and heard, what was far more than equivalent to that earlier manifestation. They would rely on the faithfulness of their omnipotent Lord, at all times, and in every instance, to verify his own words, by making the eucharistic elements to be *effectually*, what he had named them; and, in this assurance, they would contemplate him, as not less graciously and influentially present, in those holy mysteries, than he had been personally present, in those interviews with which he had favoured them, before ascending to his throne of glory in the heavens.

I have thus ventured to suppose, as matter of moral certainty, the estimate of the Eucharist which would

be made by the Apostles, under the mere guidance of our Saviour's expressions. But I am ready to acknowledge, that the force of this argument may not be felt to imply actual demonstration; and that its success will be in proportion only to a certain mental pre-disposition. Many will, doubtless, still ask, If these things are so, why has not this view of the Eucharist been expressly given in holy Scripture? If such had been the judgment of the Apostles, might we not expect to find an explicit declaration of it, in some part of the Apostolic writings?

This question would be reasonable; but the answer is easy; since, through the wisdom of heaven, St. Paul has been led, by certain irregularities among the Corinthians, so to speak of the Eucharist, in his first epistle to that church, as to place the Apostolic doctrine beyond possibility of doubt.

It appears, that many members of the Corinthian church had defiled their Christian purity, by participating in feasts celebrated in heathen temples, and consisting of viands, which had been offered at the shrine of idols. Of this practice, as might well be supposed, St. Paul speaks with horror; but it is very remarkable, that, in his expostulation, he dwells, neither on the sanctity inherent in the Christian character generally, nor on the spiritual privileges and blessings so often the subject of his discourse: instead of this, he urges his charge on the single ground, that the mysterious sanctity of the Lord's Supper was

grossly and dangerously profaned, by any intermixture, in its recipients, with the table and the cup of demons.

The Apostle commences, by adducing the case of the ancient Israelites, whose special relation to God he so describes, as to evince the close analogy, between their peculiar circumstances and those of Christians generally, in point of characteristic distinctions, and of the Corinthian Christians particularly, in point of crime and punishment.

The analogy in characteristic distinctions, he thus intimates: "They" (the Israelites) "were all baptized unto Moses: in the cloud, and in the sea; and they did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual rock which followed them; and that rock was Christ."

It need not be remarked, that, in this exordium, St. Paul, with all the skill of a master in discourse, lays a ground for making the holy Eucharist his theme. But does he not do more than this? Does he not, even already, intimate the specific view which *he* took of that ordinance, and in which he meant to represent it? The Israelites, he would have it understood, resembled Christians, in having been sustained with spiritual meat and spiritual drink; that is, evidently, with meat and drink, which had in their nature and substance, something supernatural and divine. But what, by consequence, does this

pointed parallel imply, respecting its Christian counterpart? It was, surely, far from St. Paul's thoughts, to give to the type the greater, and to the anti-type the lesser glory. It follows, therefore, that in so designating the sustenance of the Israelites, he intended to convey, even beforehand, a like idea of the eucharistic symbols; these, he implies, are, also, spiritual meat, and spiritual drink; that is, have in them a transcendent quality, similarly supernatural and divine.

After an enumeration of instances, in which the Israelites had signally transgressed, and were as signally corrected, the Apostle enters directly upon his subject; and, in the first place, appeals to the settled belief of Christians, universally, respecting the nature of the Lord's Supper: "The cup of blessing," says he, "which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"

This interrogatory form deserves particular notice: it implies, that there was, already, such unanimous consent in the Christian church, respecting the nature and import of the Lord's Supper, as to make it necessary only to take for granted the matter of that belief. Let, then, the terms of the Apostle, thus deliberately and decisively applied, be attentively weighed: he does not give a general estimate of the Eucharist, as being the most important and appropriate act of Christian devotion; but he distinctly and

emphatically specifies the mysterious character and efficacy, which the material elements of bread and wine acquired, by their consecration to the holy purpose for which they were appointed.

In a word, according to the Apostle, and that universal belief to which he appeals, the commemorative celebration of the Eucharist, as a devotional act, is not that which makes it peculiarly beneficial and venerable; but it is so, because, in this ordinance, the aliments which Christ has appointed, become, through his designation and blessing, the direct vehicles of his own divine influences, to capable receivers. Nothing short of this notion would accord with the ascribing of spiritual virtue, specially, to each visible sign; and, what is still more, to each, not as becoming efficacious, through *the act of receiving*, but as endued with efficacy, through *the act of consecration*.

For, we must observe, it is not "the cup of blessing which we *drink*," nor "the bread which we *eat*," that are declared to be the communion of the blood, and the communion of the body, of Christ, but it is said, "the cup of blessing which we *bless*; and the bread which we *break*;" clearly indicating, that the eucharistic elements, when once solemnly sanctified according to our Lord's appointment, are to be regarded as being in an inexplicable, but deeply awful manner, the receptacles of that heavenly virtue, which his divine power qualifies them to convey. On such

a subject, it would be presumptuous to indulge in any hypothetic speculation. But it would be still more blameable, and at least as prejudicial, not to allow to the Apostle's words all their due import; especially as those very words contain, the only direct definition of the Eucharist in the sacred writings.

If the language of St. Paul could need elucidation, it might be strictly compared with the several expressions of our Lord, already adverted to; but these must, of themselves, recur; and, at once, fix the unequivocal, however mysterious import, of *the communion of his body*, and *the communion of his blood*. In this accumulated light, it must be felt impossible, that the thing signified should be disproportioned to the force of the expression; and the conclusion, on the whole, must inevitably appear to be, that as our Lord had taught his followers to expect, from his divine person, such influences of his body, and of his blood, as should be, not figurative or illusive, but substantive and vital; and as, in his institution of the Eucharist, he constituted the consecrated bread and wine, the virtual representatives of his body and blood, and by consequence, the effective vehicles of their influences to all capable partakers, so, what our Lord had thus declared, and thus established, is comprehensively contained, and as if solemnly countersigned, in the clear and authoritative recognition of his Apostle.

But even this emphatical passage is only a part of what St. Paul has delivered on the subject of the Eucharist. As, in the wisdom of God, it was on this occasion alone to be directly the theme of discourse, so, accordingly, the Apostle seems anxious to leave nothing unsaid, that could illustrate the doctrine, or enforce the consequent duty. Having, therefore, by his interrogatory appeal, called attention to the profound and awful nature of the Eucharist, he proceeds to argue, from the case of Jewish sacrifices, with what cautious veneration this Christian mystery ought to be treated. "Consider Israel, after the flesh," he says, and asks—" were not they, who ate of the sacrifices, partakers of the altar?" The argument is brief, but the inference cannot be mistaken. The Apostle clearly implies, that the same kind of sanctity, which had been ascribed to things offered on God's altar, under the old law, was now to be ascribed to the eucharistic symbols. That sanctity, he intimates to have been given to the Jewish sacrifices, by the altar on which they had been offered; according to our Lord's declaration, that it is "the altar which sanctifieth the gift;" and *such* he conceives to have been the communication of sanctity, to the matter of the sacrifice, that the partakers in the one, participated also in the other. Such, then, he would have it understood, was strictly in its kind, however more spiritual in its purpose, the sanctity derived by the eucharistic symbols from their high designation, and.

through them, conveyed unto the persons of those who partook of them.

That this was, distinctly, St. Paul's meaning, is confirmed by the design which he had in view; namely, that those Corinthians, who had frequented idolatrous banquets, might be awakened to a full sense, not only of the gross profaneness, but also of the personal danger, of their conduct On this particular point, he proceeds to enlarge. Even already, however, he has said enough to show, that, in his judgment, a divinely effective virtue became, through consecration, mysteriously united with the eucharistic symbols; and was, through them, communicated beneficially to capable receivers; and, as it should seem, in some such awful manner, to *every* receiver, as to make his contact with any unholy thing, a matter not less of peril to himself, than of insult to the majesty of heaven.

In continuing his expostulation, the Apostle retains the idea of sacrificial communicative influence; and applies it to that criminal intermixture, which it was his immediate object to reprobate. "The things," says he, "which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons, and not to God, and I would not that ye should be communicants of demons."* Such, there-

* As before, in the 18th verse, the Israelites, by eating the sacrifice, were, κοινωνοι του θυσιαστηριου (partakers of the altar), so, in the 20th verse, the Corinthians, by eating idol sacrifices, are κοινωνοι των δαιμονιων (communicants of demons).

fore, is his deduction, merely from the contrariety, between sacrifices to God, and sacrifices to demons. But the particular subject of which the Apostle was treating, called for yet stronger denouncement; he, therefore, immediately adds,—"Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of demons; ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord, and the table of demons. Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? are we stronger than he?"

The strength of these expressions is remarkable. It seems as if they were intended to convey all possible awfulness of admonition; "ye *cannot*" do it, says the Apostle, as if he meant to pronounce, that there was some provision in the invisible world, as certain in its operation as the laws of nature, in readiness to avenge such profanation; to which mysterious vengeance they would infallibly expose themselves, should they neglect his warning. But on what does he rest the certainty of that result? Not on the moral contrariety of the two acts, however real or extreme, but strictly, on the opposite import and effectiveness of the two cups, and of the two tables, as being respectively the mediums, of communion with the Lord, and of communion with demons.

It is, in fact, the profane and unnatural mixture, of things the most sacred, with things the most unhallowed, in this visible world, and that, in their own persons, with which St. Paul charges the Corinthians; and as if he himself was struck with inexpressible horror, at the outrage to Omnipotence itself, which

such enormity involved, he gives his feelings vent, in an appeal to all that was impressible in human nature, "Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? are we stronger than he?"

It was not possible to add greater weight to all that he had spoken, than by this interrogatory. The Jewish high-priest could not have given a more terrible warning, to some daring intruder into the Holy of Holies. The words are awful; they are as pregnant in meaning, as they are resistless in force. They attest the feeling with which St. Paul had spoken, and guard his words against even the possibility of a figurative construction. And here, for the time, he drops the subject; perhaps, that an interval for reflection, on all he had just said, and, especially, on his last most awful expostulation, might the better prepare the minds of those to whom he wrote, for what was yet to come.

He had, in fact, another enormity to complain of, and for that purpose he reserves, what is, most strictly, the sequel of his former discourse. He had ended, in the first instance, with the judgments of God, as matter of awful apprehension. From this point he proceeds, when, in the next chapter, he brings his second charge against them, respecting the Eucharist; namely, that of treating it with disrespect, in the very act of celebration. In his animadversions on this flagrant violation of Christian duty, he appeals to their own experience, for frequent verifications, even al-

ready, of that tremendous menace, by which he had, as it were, rivetted and sealed his preceding remonstrance.

That he may the more surely gain his purpose, he first lays the strongest possible ground, by reciting the record of the eucharistic institution, not only as received by him from the report of his brethren, but as directly made known by divine revelation to himself. After repeating those quick and powerful words, which had given imperishable dignity and virtue to that bread, and that cup, as implying the showing forth of the Redeemer's death, as well as (what had been before dwelt upon) the communion of his body and blood, he thus proceeds in his admonition,—"Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the Lord's body."

I have quoted this passage at large, that I may call attention to the closeness, with which the Apostle adheres to the idea of the distinct and specifical elements, rather than to the general act of commemoration or communion. There is a kind of physiognomy in language, by which we seem to see, as well as understand, the mind of the writer. Thus, in the passage now transcribed, we not only receive the instruction intended to be conveyed, but, in the preci-

sion of the terms, the strictness with which they are adhered to, and the energy with which they are applied, we have, as it were, the very stamp and signature of St. Paul's own mind and heart. Not only, from first to last, does he keep the eucharistic elements in his view, but he says nothing which does not expressly refer to them. Thus, as the crime is, eating or drinking unworthily, so the punishment is the *eating and drinking* of judgment, (that is, of bodily infliction;) as if the very receiving of those holy things into the human person, when defiled by polluting contact, or desecrated by actual irreverence, produced, of itself (like the Ark of the Covenant when profanely treated), the calamity, or destruction of the offender. Again, the desecrating irreverence is stated to arise, from not discerning *the Lord's Body*; that is, from approaching the sacramental symbols, without due discrimination of their transcendent quality. In this awful designation of the matter of the sacrament, the Apostle seems to have thought his subject carried to its height. What more, in truth, could even St. Paul have added, either for the correction of the Corinthians, or for the instruction of all succeeding Christians?

He therefore merely strengthens what he has said, by referring to those divine judgments, which had been already inflicted. "For this cause," says he, "many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep." The Corinthians themselves had probably

been suffering these calamities, without adverting to their actual source. But this awful explanation would, at once, lead them to compare their crime and punishment, with those signal cases of a like nature, recorded in Holy Scripture; with that, for example, of Nadab and Abihu, who offered strange fire on God's altar; with that of the Philistines, who brought the ark into the house of Dagon; with that of the Bethshemites, whose profane curiosity led them to look into the ark, and who became the victims of their own presumption; and with that of Uzzah, who drew his own instant death from the ark, by an inconsiderate touch. They must, at once, have seen and acknowledged, that what was just and necessary, in those ancient instances of divine chastisement, must be accounted equally just and necessary, in the case then existing; since every reason that could be conceived, for fencing the symbols of divine presence und power, under the Old Testament, must hold good, for an equal fencing, of similar symbols, under the New Testament. It could not, for one moment, be imagined, that either the altar, or the ark of the Lord, should be guarded by more terrible majesty, than that which, on equally divine authority, was to be "discerned" as "the Lord's Body."

But does not the awful warning, respecting "eating or drinking unworthily," intimate, by parity of reason, or rather on a still surer ground, the divine potency of the elements, to all qualified receivers? For, if to

eat or drink unworthily, is to eat and drink divine malediction, then, no less surely, to eat and drink worthily, is to eat and drink divine benediction. It is evidently, according to St. Paul, the mysterious sanctity of the thing unworthily received, which makes it the vehicle of vengeance to him, by whom it is profaned. But if the sacred symbols be thus endued with a supernatural influence, to avenge their abuse, they must possess a like supernatural influence, where they are duly and reverently received, to benefit and bless the receiver. In fact, we must conclude, that it is their being divinely fitted to bless, which alone could give them an avenging power, when profaned; and, consequently, that the Apostle, in adding this last distinct and emphatical declaration, confirms all that he had said before, and puts the Christian doctrine of the Eucharist beyond the possibility of question.

To understand the mysterious term of the Lord's Body, in any such gross sense as has been fancied in the church of Rome, would be to overlook our Redeemer's expressions, already in part quoted, "It is the spirit which quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing. The words which I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."

But let us not therefore rush into an opposite extreme; nor treat the words of an inspired Apostle, as we would not treat those of any common intelligent writer. Let us observe, that every expression

St. Paul uses, tends, as it were, more and more, to invest the sacramental symbols with an ineffable measure, of derivative dignity, and instrumental virtue. He gives no shadow of pretext for any carnal interpretation; but he says all that could be said, to make us regard "that bread, and that cup," not only as the visible pledge, but the effective organ, of a vital communication, from the invisible, but then specially operative, and therefore specially present, Redeemer. For he alone it is, who could make those symbols to be, in virtue and efficacy, his body and blood.

In thus explaining the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the Apostle most trully tells us a mystery; but a mystery which (as has been observed) the first Christians were prepared, by every divine analogy, to receive; and which could scarcely need vindication in these latter times, if the zeal of contending Christians did not so generally neglect all truth, even of Holy Scripture itself, which does not directly serve as a weapon against the error, real or supposed, which they are anxious to refute, or as a support to the particular theory, which it is their purpose to maintain.

On this account chiefly, rather than because laboured elucidation was at all necessary, have I dwelt so long on the Apostle's expressions. I have not wished to add any thing to their strength, much less to turn them from their intended aim. I have merely been anxious, by the minutest attention, and the most sober

consideration, to elicit from them their precise and entire meaning; especially as it has pleased the divine wisdom, that these passages of the 10th and 11th chapters of the first Corinthians, should be the sole instance, in which the doctrine of the Eucharist is *infallibly* stated and explained.

But, perhaps, it may still be doubted, whether it be essential to the due estimation, and beneficial use, of the Lord's Supper, that the Apostle's expressions should be as literally interpreted, as they have been in the preceding observations; and whether he may not be considered, as, in some measure, employing a figurative mode of speech, to which it will not be unreasonable to give a proportionally qualified construction.

To this I would answer, that in every passage of Holy Scripture, as well as in that more immediately in view, it ought to be our first care to ascertain, in what manner the divine speaker, or writer, means to be understood. If in a figurative manner, some key will assuredly be given us, whereby to arrive at the simple and solid sense. This, perhaps, will be intimated, in the very terms which are used, by the obvious impossibility of any other interpretation; or, at least, the context will afford such light, as to explain the import, if not also to illustrate the fitness, of the metaphorical expressions. It would be easy to produce examples; but the passage particularly be-

fore us, could, on no reasonable ground, be included in them: for I conceive it would be impossible to point out *one* strictly figurative term, in the entire discourse.

A figurative term is that, which, by substituting some other term or terms, may be translated into plain language. But if the expressions of St. Paul, respecting the Eucharist, be tried by this rule, their import, be it ever so mysterious, cannot be proved metaphorical. For instance, what plainer terms could we pretend to substitute, for *the communion of the blood;* or *the communion of the body of the Lord?* Nay, the very term of *the Lord's body,* is so used by him, as infinitely to transcend all attempts at adequate explication. When the Church of Christ is called his body, we see at once that it is a figure, from our acquaintance with the subject thus denominated. But when we read of the Lord's eucharistic body, we read of something not otherwise made known to us; and, therefore, cannot similarly resolve its import, into a plainer notion; which will be no less the case with our Saviour's several expressions already adverted to. To weigh the consonant terms of our Lord and his Apostles, with sobriety and humility, will be to feel, that they unitedly assure us of a heavenly and spiritual reality, divine in its source, infallible in its efficacy, inconceivably venerable in its nature and character, and no less dreadful in its profanation. What is said therefore on this subject, is not figura-

tive, but it is mysterious and transcendental; because, obviously, the thing signified, rises, not only above the language, but the conception, of man. St. Paul had learned what he delivers (he tells us) by revelation; most probably when he was caught up into paradise, and heard "unspeakable words." When, therefore, the Apostle speaks, as in the instance before us, of that which is heavenly and divine, we must, in reason, believe, that, however exalted his language, the matter of which he speaks is incomparably more exalted; and that if we would do justice, to him, to the subject, and to ourselves, we must understand his terms in the fulness of their import, as even then, we shall only see by means of a glass, obscurely; and, therefore, be liable, through the least aberration of our mental vision, either to see delusively, or not to see at all.

But may it not be apprehended, that the ascribing of such instrumental importance, to the material elements of bread and wine, as the literal interpretation of St. Paul's expression would imply, involves an inconsistency with that purely spiritual character, which is regarded as the great distinction of the gospel dispensation?

To this it might with reason be answered, that, in forming our notions of the gospel dispensation, we are not to trust to any general conclusions, however plausible, but simply to its own representations of itself.

From these we shall learn, that, though the gospel is purely spiritual in its ends, the means which it employs, are most wisely adapted and proportioned, to the mixed nature of man. It is the exquisiteness of this accommodation, which constitutes the most conclusive internal evidence, that the author of Christianity needed not that any should testify to him of man, inasmuch as he knew what was in man. To a creature consisting, not of spirit only, but of soul and body also, how disproportionate would have been a scheme of moral improvement, much more of moral disenthralment, adapted exclusively to the highest portion of his nature?

But the fact is, that the gospel commenced in an accommodation to man's animal exigencies, which was as admirable, as it was gracious; and which the hosts of heaven contemplated with delight and wonder. The incarnation of the co-eternal Son, through which St. John was enabled to declare, what he and his fellow apostles "had seen with their eyes, what they had looked upon, and their hands had handled, of the word of life," was, in the first instance, so to consult human nature, in its animal and sensitive capacity, as to give the strongest pledge, that a dispensation, thus introduced, would, in every subordinate provision, manifest the same spirit, and operate on the same principle.

For could it be thought, that the first wonderful accommodation of Godhead, to the sensitive apprehen-

sions of man, should be wholly temporary? and that, though that mystery of godliness was ever to be regarded, as the vital source of all spiritual benefits and blessings, no continuance of this wise and gracious condescension should be manifested in the means, whereby its results were to be perpetuated, and made effectual?

May we not rather conclude, that, on the same wise and gracious consideration, which induced the divine nature to enshrine itself in a human person, that, through that medium, there might be a more familiar, more impressive, and more engaging communication of God with man; it would be deemed by the divine wisdom and goodness, most suitable to man's natural feelings and conceptions, to convey to him the special influences of incarnate Deity, through a medium, similarly adapted to his imagination, and his senses? And when we believe, (as, if we are Christians, we must believe,) that he who was God over all, united himself to so low a thing as human flesh, in order to become the fountain of those influences, we surely need not question the credibility of his conveying those influences, through any other work of his own hands, which he saw it fit to appoint. When he had condescended to imbody himself in our flesh, that he might, more conformably to the laws of our nature, give spiritual life to the world, and when he was establishing a perpetual ordinance, expressly to represent that primary mystery,

and to subserve its purpose by instrumentally communicating its virtue, was it either unsuitable, or improbable, that the heavenly grace, to be thus communicated, should be, as it were, imbodied, in two of the purest and simplest provisions, which, as Creator of the world, he had given, for the sustenance of our animal life, and the refreshment of our animal weakness?

The expediency of such a method, as peculiarly fitted to impress the mind of man, is illustrated (as has been observed) by all the analogous instances already adverted to. In no case could the divine power itself have required any medium of operation; and, therefore, every thing of this kind, must have been employed, in order to an easier apprehension, and a deeper feeling, of the source from which the benefit proceeded. It was chiefly to give such an apprehension, and excite such a feeling, that miraculous works were wrought; and that end could not have been more infallibly secured, than by enduing with supernatural efficacy, an instrumental means, which, in itself, was utterly inefficacious. It was obviously by no general law, that a benefit thus conferred had been accomplished; nor would it require any reasoning to establish the belief, that the virtue which had so wonderfully imbodied itself in a material vehicle, could be no less than a real and substantive influence from the divine omnipotence.

Was it not then, if possible, still more requisite, that a like apprehension, and a like feeling, should be ensured, respecting the highest and holiest communication, that had ever proceeded from God to man? Estimating the blessing conveyed in the Eucharist, by the united representation of our Lord, and of St. Paul, can we suppose, that any suitable means would be omitted of attesting, to our reason and natural feelings, the divinity of that blessing? And what could be more suitable, than that the same expedient, which had been employed, to impress human feeling, with the sense of divine operation, in so many inferior instances, should be employed for the same necessary purpose, in the very highest instance in which man while on this earth, was to be the subject of divine operation, and the receiver of supernatural blessings?

Instead, therefore, of questioning the literal import of St. Paul's expressions, shall we not rather recognise, in that import, the uniformity of the divine proceedings? and the depth of that wisdom, which, not more for the humbling of the proud, than for the consolation of the humble, continues, in the sublimest instance on this side of heaven, to make the weakness of the instrument an irrefragable evidence, that the blessing received, is directly, and purely, from himself? The assurance of this fact is invaluable; and it would be impossible to imagine any more suitable way, in which such assurance could have been given. It leaves to faith its entire exercise, inasmuch as no

extraordinary impression is made, either on the external, or the internal sense; but it exercises faith in the highest and happiest manner, by presenting to it an object, which, in its nature and in its nearness, must be felt to unite, heaven with earth, and God with man. Such is the reckoning which even reason must make, if the actual transmission of divine influence, through the elements, be once admitted We, doubtless, *can* conceive heavenly influence to be communicated, without any medium whatever; but we *cannot* conceive a spiritual influence, conveyed through such material mediums, to be any other than heavenly and divine.

But, in addition to what we may deduce, from the general method of the divine proceedings, and from the reason of the case, do we not find, by actual experience, that such an unequivocal pledge of divine operation was necessary, to preserve the belief of such operation "whole and undefiled," in the Christian Church? The fact of strictly supernatural grace, though in itself so consolatory, is retained with difficulty in the sceptical mind of man. It has, accordingly, been modified in various ways, by some persons, and boldly rejected by others. To establish therefore an ordinance, in the obvious aspect and consistent import of which, the doctrine of strictly supernatural grace should ever have a divine attestation was, to perpetuate this most important point of faith

in the surest and most practical manner. It provided for the close and candid Christian reasoner, imperishable premises, leading to the most certain conclusions; and it afforded to the simply devout, an instruction, through the senses, to the mind, which would teach deeper things than language could convey; and make an impression on the inmost feelings, of which their indistinct apprehension would neither abate the awfulness, nor substantially prevent the utility.

It is, on the contrary, to be remarked, that where the notion of the Lord's Supper has been such, as to exclude the instrumental efficacy of the sacramental symbols, the ordinance itself has appeared to lose its interest and attractiveness. Of this fact we have decisive evidence, in a complaint made by the pious Doddridge, in one of his sermons to young persons, wherein he invites religious youth, to early communion. "I have frequently found," he says "and I believe it has been the experience of many of my brethren in the ministry, that young persons, not only of a very sober and regular conduct, but even those who have appeared most deeply impressed with the concerns of their souls, and experimentally acquainted, so far as we can judge, with regenerating grace, have, in many instances, shown a strange coldness to this blessed institution; and we have known not a few, who have grown old in the neglect of it!" But whence this indifference, which the worthy Doddridge so candidly acknowledges, and so sincerely la-

ments? Did it not arise from his, and his brethren's view of the Lord's Supper, as a mere commemorative and covenanting transaction, in which grace was to be, as in other religious ordinances, exercised and improved, but no special communication of heavenly influence to be expected? Had the Eucharist been regarded as a divinely instituted conduit of supernatural grace, directly from its fountain, could such persons as Doddridge describes, have been remiss in their attendance? In that case, would not their love and value of the Lord's Supper be in exact proportion, to their love and value of religion itself? But whenever the strictly supernatural influence of the Eucharist is overlooked, or unacknowledged, (and such will naturally, if not necessarily, be the consequence of rejecting the mysterious designation of the symbols,) attention to this Christian ordinance, will be little more than gratuitous; a natural effect, perhaps, of Christian ardour, because it is matter of divine injunction, but not a necessary result of Christian sincerity. It is, in this view of it, merely a positive law of Christianity, acting exclusively upon the feelings of fear, of duty, or of gratitude. Contemplated as the actual vehicle of Christ's own ineffable influences, to the capable receiver it becomes a matter of intrinsic interest, to neglect which, would be to neglect both present and everlasting salvation.

Besides, the sacred Eucharist, when thus conceived, becomes not only more attractive to the up-

right Christian, but also much more consolatory. When this holy ordinance is supposed to rise above the other means of grace, not by any appropriate influence of omnipotent power, but only by its more direct reference to the mercy and goodness of the dying Redeemer, the Christian, in partaking of it, can expect benefit, in proportion only to the actual state of his devotional feelings. Let his confidence in the promised grace of Christ be ever so sincere, his hope of a fresh communication will rise, or fall, with the conscious ardour, or the conscious coldness, of his affections. But these not being at human command, and seldom or never moving in exact proportion to the settled purposes of the heart, the consequence, on the whole, will naturally be, that when animating influences are most needed, they will be least expected. Whereas, if there be a persuasion, that divine grace is communicated, in, and through, the Sacrament, by a special exercise of divine power, it will follow that, not an inability to co-operate, but solely an incapacity to receive, will obstruct the communication.*

* It is not possible, within such narrow limits as I have prescribed to myself, to guard the thought, expressed in this paragraph, against the danger of misapprehension. To answer this purpose, I must have gone into something like digression, which would have perplexed the thread of my discourse. I will therefore merely observe, that I proceed upon a principle of the Catholic Church, rested in by the Revisers of our Liturgy in 1661, when conferring, previously, with the Non-Conformist Divines,—namely, that "God's sacra-

The importance of this distinction, I humbly conceive, will be felt by every one, who has religiously inspected himself. In efforts of the heart to rise toward God, *to will* may be most sincerely present with us, when, how to perform that which is good, we find not. Even in an advanced stage of piety, there may be least power of mental exertion, when its sensible necessity is greatest; for instance, under infirmity of body or mind; or when some distressing event has caused, what St. Peter calls, "heaviness, through manifold temptations." How comfortable, then, amid this "weakness of our mortal nature," to reflect, not only that God *can* internally aid and strengthen us, by his own secret influences, independently of our active co-operation, but that he has assured us of this unspeakable blessing, by such a permanent pledge and means of its accomplishment, as, by its very character and nature, supersedes all co-operation, and requires, solely, the faculty of reception. If only we are athirst, we have here a fountain of life, to which we may indeed come, without money, and without price; and which comes to us without any diluting intermixture, as immediately flowing from the throne of God, and of the Lamb.

But this view of the Lord's Supper, not only ministers to encouragement, where encouragement is want-

ments have their effects, where the receiver doth not, *ponere obicem*, put any bar against them."—Account of the Proceedings of the Commissioners of both Persuasions, &c. p. 99.

ing, but it also serves to repress all spiritual pride, and undue self gratulation. It is observable, that those sincere maintainers of God's effectual grace, who do not regard the Eucharist as the actual conduit of its conveyance, deem it necessary to guard the supposed possessors of that grace, against robbing God of his honour, by ascribing to themselves, what they owe to his bounty. And there can be no doubt, that such a false reckoning is much more than incidental, where the view is directed only to those means of grace, in which the human faculties so co-operate, as to make it impossible to draw a distinct line, between what supervenient grace does in the transaction, and what man does for himself. But wherever the Eucharist is considered as the appropriate vehicle, of the animating and strengthening grace of Christ to man, such cautions, as those adverted to, will hardly be requisite.

He who clearly and confidently expects to receive, in "the cup of blessing which is blessed, the communion of Christ's blood," and in "the bread which is broken, the communion of Christ's body," will naturally and necessarily depreciate all that he could do for himself, in comparison with that transcendent communication. In the sublime simplicity of the eucharistic institution, the humble expectant of heavenly blessing is abstracted from all human agency, of others, or of himself The solemn words, used from the earliest times, in both the eastern and western

church, and, through the distinguishing providence of God, preserved in our own, "*Sursum corda*," and the reply of the faithful, "*Habemus ad Dominum*,"* speak the one common feeling, infallibly excited, by "discerning the Lord's body" in the consecrated symbols: and, by consequence, looking for the blessing exclusively from him, who makes those elements "the hiding of his power."† The mind thus impressed, will feel no tendency to ascribe to itself, the benefits it may have received. If spiritual life be consciously felt to gain strength and ascendancy, the fixed belief of a sacramental conveyance of that life, will, at once, increase the feeling of delight and of humility,—of delight, because the influences thus communicated, are so purely from the Godhead itself, as to imply a real commencement, as well as certain pledge, of everlasting beatitude; of humility, because the direct and unmixed apprehension of the divine power and presence, which the discernment of the Lord's body in the symbols must imply, cannot but impress upon the mind of man, such a sense of his own comparative baseness and nothingness, and inspire such an habitual and deep sobriety, as could not be conceived equally producible, through any other existing means in this lower world.

And as the lowliness thus infused, is of the same nature with that of angels, and has in it no tendency

* "Lift up your hearts! R. We lift them up unto the Lord."
† Habakkuk, iii. 4.

to superstitious weakness, so the satisfaction which is enjoyed, has no relation to enthusiastic illusion. This latter is always the offspring of a supposed distinguishing communication from God; a peculiar afflatus, as it is imagined, by the mere will of the Spirit; and not subject to be controlled, even by the clearest rules of scripture. But however elevating the idea of the eucharistic intercourse with God, the mind is hereby raised to no giddy height; the elevation, which must be experienced under a full apprehension of this divine provision, is as sober, as it is sublime. The vouchsafement is neither personal, nor partial; but extended to every capable member of the Christian Church: the apparatus is such, as to act neither on the sensitive, nor the passionate feelings, but solely on the purest perceptions of the mind, and the soundest sensibilities of the heart: and the adorable agency itself, has nothing in it akin to the whirlwind, the earthquake, or the fire, but, in this instance, operates as in the great economy of visible nature; with the same silence, as in causing the earth to vegetate, or the planets to move in their orbits, through the heavens. Need it then be said, that the glare of the meteor does not differ more from the light of the sun, than the transports of the enthusiast differ from those exalted apprehensions, which deep views of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper must naturally, both awaken, and sustain, in every devout mind and heart?

I have already adverted to the mysterious communication which the Eucharist imparts, being a pledge of the same divine presence, in, and with, the Christian Church, as the Jewish Church had enjoyed, in the inner sanctuary of its Temple. But on this particular point, I must beg leave to offer a few additional observations.

I observed, that such a communication of divine influence, as could be affected only by the omnipotent power of our Redeemer, must also, of necessity, imply his special and extraordinary presence; and I inferred, that the Apostles and their brethren would thus feel themselves amply compensated, for that noblest of all Jewish privileges, the special residence of Jehovah in the midst of his people; inasmuch as in the eucharistic institution, estimated as our Lord himself had taught them, their mental eye would recognise a Shechinah as real, as that which had taken possession of the Holy of Holies, at the dedication of the Temple built by Solomon.

To illustrate the importance of this particular consideration, may it not be remarked, that though the omnipresence of God is a most awful and momentous truth, yet, even in the best disposed minds, the sense merely, of this presence, however it must excite philosophical reverence, would scarcely awaken filial affection. Then only can we contemplate God as our father, when we have assurance that he regards us as his children; and that we are distinctly and

individually, within the gracious notice, and under the direct influence, of our Almighty parent.

The patriarchs of old were, doubtless, firm in their belief of the divine omnipresence.* But this alone would scarcely have supported them, when they "went forth, not knowing whither they went" Their supreme consolation arose from the persuasion, that the eye of God was specially upon them, and the hand of God directly and effectively upon them; to which happy confidence they had been raised, by such manifestations of his special presence, repeatedly made to them, as were, at the time, a matter of unutterable comfort, and left behind them a "home-felt delight," and "sober certainty," which no earthly circumstances were sufficient to destroy.

In those instances, the awe of infinite Deity was necessarily felt; but this naturally overwhelming sentiment, was softened into utterable peace and joy,

*The degree and manner in which pious persons, under the Jewish dispensation, were impressed with the divine omnipresence, is admirably exemplified in the 139th Psalm. But the question is, could that great truth have been either so practically felt, or so magnificently descanted on, except where the established fact of a special presence gave it animation and sustenance?

The Prayer of Solomon, at the dedication of the Temple, (1 Kings, viii.) also contains as sublime a recognition of the Divine omnipresence, as could be expressed in words (v. 27.); and yet every subsequent portion of that noble piece of devotional eloquence, gives evidence of the confidence and consolation, which the devout king derived, from the anticipation of a *specially present God*, who *thus*, in boundless mercy, adapted his infinitude, to the apprehensions and affections of his limited and dependent creatures.

by such undelusive demonstrations of the Friend and the Father. Hence, the very places where those manifestations had been made, became dear to the patriarchs. To those memorable scenes they loved to return, that they might there offer up their homage with excited recollection, deeper gratitude, and more sensible consolation.

The care which was taken to continue to the posterity of the patriarchs, the same substantial demonstration of a specially present God, has been already dwelt upon; and nothing additional need be said to show, that this exercise of divine condescension was carried to its utmost height, in the incarnation of the Eternal Word; all former tokens or evidences of the special presence of Jehovah, being, in comparison with the actual advent of Emmanuel, God with us, but preparatives and prelibations.

Taking, then, this long-continued, and, at length, consummated, condescension of God, to that nature which he had given to man, into our consideration; and keeping in view the entire sameness of human nature, under the Christian, as under the patriarchal and Jewish dispensations; can we imagine, that, when the Godhead had come nearest, and had most intimately familiarised itself with man, all substantive intercourse with our Emmanuel was thenceforward to cease, and that the highest dispensation should wholly want that natural satisfaction, with which lower dispensations had been so signally favoured; and which,

while man possessed the same organisation of spirit, soul, and body, could never cease to be panted after, and virtually demanded?

That the Incarnate Word, after finishing the work of his humiliation, should no longer manifest himself to the external senses, was declared by himself to be expedient, as requisite to that spiritual course, in which his disciples were, from that time, to proceed.

But it was essential to this very design, that they should consider him as withdrawn from their bodily senses only; and that, as far as their exigencies required, he would still be as really present with them, as in the days of his flesh.

But, to establish this assurance, some divine pledge was indispensable. Without some token, by which his special approach to them should be notified, and on their recurrence to which, they might confide that he would be invisibly present with them, to aid and bless them, as effectually as if they saw him in the midst of them,—without such a provision, I say, the Christian dispensation would have had no adequate security, against such vagueness of apprehension, and coldness of affection, as would have sunk it far below the level of Jewish devotion. The mind of Christians, in that case, could have rationally contemplated only the divine *omnipresence*; and the piety of the intelligent and sober-minded, could have been little better than a more definite, and more firmly grounded, natural religion. For those who had more reason

than affection, such a system might have sufficed. But, if we may say it with due reverence, however the diffusive rays of Deity, may not only afford light, but excite a degree of warmth in the spiritual, like those of the sun, in the material world; still in the one case, as in the other, it is not diffusion of rays, but the concentration of them, which produces a melting ardour.

That the apprehension merely of divine omnipresence, should not be adequate to the mental exigencies of man, is the less to be doubted, as it would seem to be insufficient for maintaining the devotion, even of higher intelligencies. We read in the book of Job, that there was a day, when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord; and that there was another day, when they did the same. Intimations of a like kind are numerous in the Old Testament; and if we attend to what is said in the Apocalypse, we shall find them still more abundant in the New. Doubtless, we can know but little of these heavenly mysteries: still, the uniform fact of a special presence, in the invisible world, is indisputable; and would it not seem to be almost a self-evident truth, that finite minds, however exalted, can apprehend the Godhead, with a satisfaction proportioned to their nature, only by means of a definite manifestation?

That this exigence is increased in man, by his terrestrial nature, needs no proof: it is obvious that, in this world, the entire movement of things is adapted

to that nature; and thus, our innate tendencies, and our external circumstances unite, to limit and modify our mental action, be the object of that action ever so exalted.

Accordingly, if we examine ourselves, we shall perceive, that, in whatever concerns us, we require definite matter of fact, on which to repose our minds, as much as we need some solid substance, to support our bodies. It is of no essential moment, through what species of evidence the matter of fact is notified to us, if only the notification have clear marks of authenticity. Hence, in human affairs, there is always more or less exercise of what may fairly be called faith, but always on an understood, or supposed ground, of unequivocal reality.

That the various evidences of our divine religion, and particularly the Holy Scriptures, are most wisely and graciously adapted to these habits of the human mind, is indisputable. But whether the utmost plenitude of recorded testimony would meet all our mental exigencies, either as infinite, or as animalised beings, appears a matter of much less easy determination. It would rather seem that, to consult fully for our finite, and still more for our terrestrial nature, in addition to all other provisions, there would be need of some impressive and demonstrative pledge, and token, of the continued direct intercourse of the all gracious Being with his human servants. Such a pledge and token would completely meet the demand of human nature,

for matter-of-fact assurance. And if the expediency of supplying that demand could not otherwise be proved, it might be inferred from what has been already adverted to; I mean, the striking tendency of those, by whom the notion of any such pledge and token is rejected, either to think illusively of the direct intercourse of God with the human spirit, or else utterly to deny its reality.

But, in following the light of our Redeemer, and the guidance of his Apostle, do we not find, in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, just such a pledge and token of the special presence, and real influence, of our God and Saviour, as at once meets the demand of our nature, and suits the high aim, and intellectual spirit, of the Christian dispensation? That life of faith, by which, as Christians, we gradually rise on the moral scale, would have been counteracted, had any impression been made on the senses; whereas, the absence of every such impression preserves from delusive mixture, the moral evidence of reality; and fits the mind for the most sober perception of its practical influence. The Great point, to which every circumstance in the institution bears witness, is, that the cup of blessing which is blessed, is the communion of the Lord's blood, and that the bread which is broken, is the communion of his body. But reason must pronounce, that earthly elements can serve so high and holy a purpose, only as instruments of the divine power, and in such an exercise of the divine

power, the special presence of the Almighty agent, according to all our habits of thinking, is necessarily implied. In yielding to the force of St. Paul's first position, we are directly led to this impressive conclusion. And its unutterable weight and interest must concur, with the infinite value of the communicated blessing, to deepen the effect upon every human feeling.

In this view, as often as we approach the table of the Lord, we may account ourselves to have admission, in a manner beyond human conception, into the presence chamber of the King Messiah. Under the full sense of this Christian privilege, we shall not need a Bethel, a Peniel, the Jewish Sanctuary, or even its Holy of Holies. In contemplating, with St. Paul, the mystery of the Eucharist, the Christian cannot but see, that, in this sacred ordinance, especially and most eminently, "a new and living way" is opened for him (far above what was granted even to the Jewish High Priest,) to "enter into the holiest, by the blood of Jesus."

Is it, then, too much to say, that the Eucharist, thus apprehended, makes the richest provision, which we could conceive to be made by any stated means in this lower world, for our spiritual sustenance and comfort? While, as a pledge and token of divine presence and influence, its authenticity never can be impaired,—its significancy, to close and sober attention never obscured,—its visible mystery will be as

wonderful, as impressive, and as inestimable, in its latest, as in its earliest celebration. The communion of the Lord's blood, and the communion of the Lord's body, must have, as terms, the same profound import,—as blessings, the same infinite value, yesterday, to-day, and for ever. Let not, therefore, the simplicity of what is visible to our bodily sight, veil from our mental eye those invisible realities, which are to us so consolatory, and in themselves so glorious. On the contrary, let us recognise the same spirit of meek majesty, which veiled its transcendant brightness, in the mystery of the incarnation, as still continuing the like gracious condescension, in the mystery of the Eucharist; and let us joyfully and reverently approach to do homage to our King, who, in this his own peculiar institution, comes to diffuse benediction, in his mystical Zion, with the same apparent lowliness, as when, in conformity with the divine prediction, he entered his literal Jerusalem, "sitting upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass."

I might now proceed in the way of contrast, to remark more particularly on those views of the Lord's Supper, which stand opposed to the explanation attempted in these pages. I might possibly show, that, by rejecting the mysterious instrumentality of the symbols, and thereby reducing the sacrament itself, externally, to a mere ceremony, and internally to an act of common Christian devotion, besides the liberty

thus taken with Holy Scripture, the eucharistic celebration at once loses all its proportioned hold (proportioned, I mean, to its high origin) on the natural reason, as well as on the natural feelings of man. But these would be, in some sort, controversial topics; and I trust the grounds on which the claims of the sacred Eucharist have been shown to rest, do not need to be defended by such auxiliaries.

I might also pursue still farther, the line of observation which I have been following. I might speak of that general influence on the whole mass of professing Christians, which might be looked for, from the doctrine of St. Paul, respecting the Lord's Supper, being literally received, and adequately promulgated. I might show, that, by this means, those who are yet insensible to the goodness and wisdom of God, manifested, in the Gospel, would be obliged to recognise another of his divine attributes, before which the hardest heart must bow,—His almighty power,—as in direct and continued exercise, within the Christian sanctuary; and I might support the justness of this reckoning, by appealing to the precise purpose for which St. Paul introduced those invaluable declarations, and the manner in which he enforces them. I might dwell upon the indescribable light and warmth, which all the other solemn services of religion would be felt to derive, from such a central sphere of Divine presence and operation; and which would even make each hallowed roof to impress him

who should come under it, with the feeling of Jacob at Bethel,—"How dreadful is this place! This is none other than the house of God; this is the gate of heaven!!"

But I forbear. I have said enough for my special purpose; and, if it gives satisfaction in the quarter, from whence the thought of examining the subject was received, the pleasure I have felt in the employment, will be deeply enhanced by such a reward.

POSTSCRIPT TO THE TREATISE ON THE EUCHARIST.

THERE are two points adverted to in the preceding observations, respecting which, I may be thought to have not sufficiently explained myself.

First, I have expressly intimated a specific difference, between the general influences of the Holy Spirit on men's minds and hearts, and those peculiar influences, for the conveyance of which, the sacrament of the Eucharist has been specially provided.

For this distinction, I conceive I have the clearest warrant of Holy Scripture. We learn, from both the New and Old Testament, that the influences of the Holy Spirit have been ever attendant on the revealed knowledge of God, with whatever degree of clearness, or fulness, the revelation was made. All true Christians agree, that those influences were always indispensable to the rectifying of man's moral nature; and, under the Jewish dispensation, we find David imploring this heavenly blessing in as strong terms, as if he had learned their necessity in the school of Christianity:—"Take not," said he, "thy Holy Spirit from me. Restore to me the joy of thy salvation, and

stablish me with thy free spirit." And we are as distinctly told, that the Holy Ghost was upon Simeon and Anna, as it is said, afterwards, of the Apostles themselves. And yet it is no less clearly asserted, that, in a certain peculiar and eminent sense, the Holy Ghost was not given, until the Lord Jesus Christ was glorified; evidently implying, that, under the Gospel dispensation, the influences of the Divine Spirit would be so much more excellent and effective, than any such influences which, till then, had been afforded, as to make those former operations seem to disappear from view, in comparison with the blessings to be conferred, in the spiritual kingdom of the Messiah.

That the communion of the Holy Spirit, to which this high distinction is given, did not consist, in those miraculous powers, with which, at the first, the special grace of the Gospel was so largely accompanied, is evident on many clear grounds. For example: those extraordinary powers were soon found to be but temporary; but the evangelical communication of the Holy Spirit, was expressly declared perpetual. "Repent," said St. Peter, on the day of Pentecost, to the Jews, who were moved by his discourse, "and be baptised every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off; even as many as the Lord our God shall call." This invalu-

able assurance was implied, even in the first express notification of such a purposed blessing, to the Apostles. "I will pray the Father," says our Lord, "and he will give you another comforter, that he may abide with you for ever." Nor is the comprehensiveness of this promise made doubtful, by its being addressed personally to the disciples alone, inasmuch as another analogous assurance, which is, in like manner, personally addressed to the Apostles only, must, from its unequivocal extension, be applied to all ages of the Church. "Go," said he, "and disciple all nations, &c.; and lo! I am with you always, even to the end of the world." It need scarcely be remarked, that the term "for ever," in the former case, if doubtful in itself, is made indubitable by this latter strictly equivalent, but still more unquestionable expression.

I forbear to adduce farther proof, that the gift of the Holy Ghost, in its high evangelical meaning, is always to be understood in a moral, and not in a miraculous sense, except by making one remark, which is too important to be omitted,—that the peculiar characters of this gift are inapplicable, to even the highest possible miraculous powers. For the evangelic gift of the Holy Ghost is declared by St. Paul, to be the earnest of the everlasting inheritance; whereas, miraculous powers were so far from being such an earnest, that our Lord assures us, he will declare, at the last day, to many who had possessed

those powers, that he never knew them. We are moreover taught by St. Paul, that where the Holy Ghost has been given, the love of God is "shed abroad in the heart;" while the same Apostle elsewhere intimates, that the highest exercise of miraculous powers may be found, where that divine affection is wanting.

What then is, in truth, that special gift of the Spirit, which is represented as the peculiar distinction, as well as supreme blessing, of the Gospel dispensation? I conceive, that if we attentively examine the New Testament, we shall find abundant, and concurrent evidence, that the gift of the Holy Spirit, which is there so emphatically dwelt upon, and so eminently designated, has direct and exclusive reference to the co-operative part, which the third person of the blessed Trinity has been pleased to take with the incarnate Word, in the work of man's spiritual redemption. It is, assuredly, far too profound a subject, to be fathomed by our scanty intellect; but that which is written, is written for our instruction; and it is, therefore, no less our duty than our interest, to examine with humility and attention, what has been made known to us on this important point, in the word of inspiration.

I conceive, that while the whole three persons of the blessed Trinity are uniformly represented, as taking a like gracious interest in the spiritual redemption of man, the actual accomplishment of the design

is more directly referred, to the distinct, yet concurrent agency, first, of the eternal Word, and secondly, of the co-eternal Spirit. I do not here enter into the enquiry, respecting what preliminary measures might have been judged necessary, to harmonize God's condescending goodness to man, with the general government of the intelligent universe. This profound subject, I conceive, is rather intimated than clearly revealed, in the sacred volume. Of this, however, we are sure, that whatever divine wisdom saw expedient, was perfectly accomplished; and may we not reasonably think, it was so accomplished, as to leave to us no other concern, than to secure to ourselves those benefits and blessings, which have been so graciously, and so wonderfully provided for us?

Of those benefits and blessings, the chief one is represented in Holy Scripture to be, the spiritual animation of our souls, by a divinely communicated influence; of which the eternal Word, made flesh, is uniformly set forth, as the directly communicative fountain. This mysterious provision, for restoring the diseased nature of man, and replenishing it with the moral health and happiness, for which it was created, was expressly promulgated by our Lord himself in his last discourse to his Apostles. Under the semblance of a vine and its branches, he instructed them in the nature of that spiritual union with him, and continual derivation of inward life and strength from him, by which they were to become qualified, in

this world, for everlasting glory in that which was to come. In this last lesson, our Lord resolved into one vitalizing principle, all the divine precepts and doctrines, which he had delivered throughout his ministry on earth. He thus taught them the source, from whence, alone, they were to receive, both the essential elements and the genuine prelibations of that immortal life, which he was then so wonderfully bringing to light by his Gospel.

That this leading truth was ever after kept in view by the Apostles, and was continually regarded by them, as the very heart-pulse of Christian faith and practice, it would be easy to establish, on the authority, not only of numberless passages in the epistolary part of the New Testament, but of the entire doctrinal tenour, which harmoniously pervades and combines the whole Christian volume. It is on this account, that our incarnate Saviour is described as the second Adam, who was to be to us the fountain of a spiritual and heavenly nature, as the first Adam has been to us the fountain of an animal and earthly nature: and we are instructed, that, as by the fall of our earthly progenitor, sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and thus one man was to all, the source of corruption and mortality; so by the grace of the one man Jesus Christ, a gift of righteousness is given to all who will receive it, which destroys the reign of sin, and is, at once, the earnest, and the principle, of a blessed immortality.

Such is the doctrine of St. Paul, in the 5th chapter of the Epistle of the Romans; and in the 6th chapter, he proceeds to show, that, not only is our Lord personally a fountain of grace, but that, in his crucifixion, his death, and his resurrection, he opened, as it were, perennial springs of specific influence, which should ever exercise an assimilating virtue, on the minds and hearts which would receive them. This mysterious truth is stated by the Apostle, in the strongest terms of which human language is capable: to imbibe those influences, is, as he teaches, to have our old man, or the corrupt nature derived from our first parent, so crucified, that we shall no longer be its servants, or compelled to obey its motions; and it is to be blessed with such a resurrection of the inner man, from the death of sin, to a new life of righteousness, as gives power not only to practise every moral virtue, but also to exercise, by substantial anticipation, the affections of the heavenly state.

There is a depth in this subject, which it would require much discourse to explore. But I believe I may confidently assert, that it is the leading subject in the New Testament; and that in the epistles of St Paul, particularly, no portion of any length could be found, in which it is not recognized, or referred to, as the one vital principle, by which the whole Christian Constitution, in its inward and spiritual import, is sustained and animated. It would be easy to adduce examples in support of this remark: but I believe

its truth will be obvious, to every intelligent and attentive reader.

It must however, be particularly observed, that, in these divine energies and influences of the incarnate Word, the co-operation of the Holy Spirit is so expressly and uniformly stated to bear a part, as to make this a point of Christian faith ever to be kept in view. We are taught to regard the third person of the Trinity, not merely as the Spirit of God, but also as the Spirit of Christ; and to consider our participation of his influence, as the Spirit of Christ, to be the test of our true Christian character; for St. Paul declares, that "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." He also instructs us, that the filial spirit of Christianity, which constitutes its chief superiority to the dispensation which had preceded, proceeds from the spirit of the Son of God being sent into our hearts, and raising our affections and our confidence, toward God as our Father.

Thus, then, on the whole, are we taught, that the richest treasures of grace and virtue are provided for us, in the adorable person of our incarnate Saviour; and that, not only in virtue of his union with our nature, but of his being crucified, his dying, and his rising again; and that those treasures are communicated to our minds and hearts, by the continued agency of the Holy Spirit, who, as it were, passes from the second Adam, into all who aspire to a spiritual union with this ineffable source of a new and heavenly

life; and makes them, at once, his own temple, and living members of the great head of the Church, to whom he unites them in a vital, and (if they faithfully concur) a still advancing, and, at length, beatific incorporation.

That this is a deeply mysterious doctrine, cannot be disputed. But it would seem impossible to read the New Testament with serious and candid attention, without perceiving, that the animating and strengthened influence of God manifest in the flesh, communicated to the inner man, through the power ot the Holy Ghost, is, in every instance, contemplated, as the great blessing of the Gospel, through which, every duty may be performed, every trial sustained, every want endured, and every seduction of earth, purely and perfectly surmounted. This is, in truth, the great object, to which the most stupendous exercise of miraculous powers was but subservient; and to make provision for which, the Lord of Glory lived on earth, died and rose again, and having ascended to heaven sent another comforter, to abide with his Church for ever.

In what respect, then most eminently and supremely, was the Holy Ghost to be the comforter of the Church? Not (as has been already intimated) by his miraculous endowments inasmuch as these were no pledge of personal salvation; not by revealing things to come, nor even by giving a mouth and wisdom, which adversaries could neither gainsay nor

resist: these operations of the Spirit were exerted on the intellectual powers; and had no necessary efficacy on the heart, which alone is the seat of true and solid comfort, as it is, in like manner, the lodging place of all the worst enemies to our peace.

In what manner, then, can we conceive the Holy Spirit, most effectually giving comfort to the heart? Is it not by his taking possession of it, under, what we may venture to call, His evangelical character: that is, as the Spirit of Christ? Our Lord, in his last discourse thus declares the high purpose of the divine Spirit's specially promised mission: "He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you." I scarcely need remark, that the "showing," of which our Lord speaks, could not mean what was merely speculative; for, by such showing, our Lord would not have been glorified. His glory is uniformly made to consist, in the manifestation of his moral and spiritual influence. The "showing," therefore, which our Saviour ascribes to the Holy Ghost, can be only an inward and spiritual notification, of our Saviour's fullness of grace and truth, to the minds and hearts of his followers: an experimental "showing," such as to imply the participation and enjoyment of those mysterious blessings, with which our Lord enriches the faithful subjects of his spiritual kingdom.

As this operation, therefore, of the Holy Spirit is, self evidently, the noblest, and the most valuable, which can be conceived in the stage of our existence,

so, to this, must we refer all that is said in the New Testament, respecting that gift of the Holy Ghost, which was to distinguish the Gospel dispensation. Whatever else may be included in that gift, or by whatever sensible demonstrations of Omnipotence it was to be verified or signalized, still we must conclude, from the whole tenour of the New Testament, that the essence of that divine gift was spiritual and heavenly; and that it was to consist in the accomplishment, through the Spirit of God, in our inner man, of all that had been purposed and provided for, in the incarnation and mysterious ministry of the Son of God. Nothing short of this could truly glorify the Redeemer, or constitute the sealing of "the spirit unto the day of redemption;" and thus only could Christians be so strengthened with might, by the Spirit, in the inner man, that Christ should (as it were) dwell in their hearts by faith, and that they should be rooted and grounded in the love of God.

Such, then, being the special and peculiar blessing of the Gospel, it might be inferred, on general grounds, if even direct evidence were wanting, that the peculiar rite of the Gospel, must have a special relation and subserviency to that blessing. But the express designation of the holy Eucharist, by our Lord himself, as his own virtual body and blood, and St. Paul's appeal to the received belief of the Church, that the blessed cup was the communion of the blood of Christ, and that the broken bread was the com-

munion of the Body of Christ, established beyond question, that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is to serve, as the external and visible medium, through which, the disciples of Christ in all ages, are to expect, through the co-operation of the Eternal Spirit, the divinely vivifying influence of his incarnate person, and the ineffable virtues of his crucifixion and death. The fact being undeniable, that there are, in the evangelic dispensation, such influences and such virtues; and those influences and virtues being denominated by our Lord himself, his flesh, and his blood, we are obliged by the terms of St. Paul, and by the still stronger terms (if that be possible) of our Lord himself, to identify the internal grace and virtue of the Eucharist, with those quickening, strengthening, and purifying communications, which are promised to Christians, as proceeding from the person and death of Christ, through the ever co-operative agency of the Holy Ghost.

It can scarcely be doubted, by any unprejudiced Christian, that the blessed Spirit has ever, in different measures, been imparting his gracious influences to the minds of men; and that, in every age and nation, it has been his work, and his delight, to foster every disposition, and to assist and sustain every honest effort, to obey "the law written in the heart." In the patriarchal line, and afterward within the Jewish pale, we may conclude, that He exerted an agency of a still more definite kind, specifically adapted, and

advancingly proportioned, to fit the introduction of the Gospel dispensation. There is, besides, no just ground for supposing, that, even in these Christian times, there may not be much greater room for the exercise, of those influences of the Divine Spirit, which are inferior and preparatory, than of those influences, which belong to the full establishment of Christ's kingdom in the heart.

The divine influence, for example, which the Catholic Church has always believed to accompany the baptismal washing, where no bar was placed, by the moral indisposedness of the subject, must, in infants especially, be regarded, as proportioned to an initiatory, and not to a consummating purpose. It would seem, that our Lord's idea of the Merchantman, in the beautiful parable of the pearl, can be realized, only, where infant baptism has been followed, by a suitable training in his nurture and discipline. But, even then, the commencing pursuit is that of goodly pearls, and not yet, distinctly and definitely, that of the pearl of great price. The less enlightened pursuit is, clearly, of that which is good; and therefore it is maintained under his influence, from whom "every good gift" proceedeth. What, therefore, the Holy Spirit condescends to effect, in that first Christian sacrament, must be considered, not as superseding, but as preparing for, those higher and fuller influences, which confer God's most "perfect gift" on earth, and put the mind and heart into actual possession of the "pearl of great price."

Is it not, then, with this highest and fullest communication of divine grace, that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper has been specifically connected, by the very words of institution? It could have been no other than that highest and fullest communication of divine grace, which our Lord has promised, and so emphatically dwelt upon, in the 6th Chapter of St. John. When, therefore, he applies those very terms, which he had declared to be, in the highest degree, significant of spirit and of life, to those sanctified elements, which he was pleased to appoint as sacramental symbols; and when he enjoins that very eating and drinking, which, in that discourse he had pronounced indispensable, to be carried into act in a visible manner, but with such profoundly significant import, in this perpetuated institution, what can we conclude, but that the sacrament of the Lord's supper is eminently, and, in a way of peculiar appropriation, the visible conduit, through which, by the invisible operation of Him who appointed it, is conveyed that special evangelical grace, with which the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, have, conjointly, distinguished and blessed the Christian dispensation?

I rest in this conclusion with the greater confidence, inasmuch as it is in this light, that the Church of England has regarded the eucharistic institution. It would be hardly possible to convey the notion, which I have wished to express, more strictly, more fully, or more profoundly, than in those words,

in which our Church describes the benefit of worthily receiving the Lord's supper. "Then," it says, "we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood; then, we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us."

The first thing remarkable in this passage is the direct reference which is made to our Lord's words, in the 6th of St. John; in the form of an express declaration, that the eating and drinking, there spoken of, are verified, in the worthy reception of the eucharistic symbols. So far, therefore, as our Lord, in that discourse, described the highest, and most appropriate benefit and blessing, conferred through his incarnation, the sacramental bread and wine are, in the judgment of the Church of England, the vehicles through which that benefit and blessing is conveyed to qualified receivers.

But our Church does not only propound this holy mystery: she proceeds to evince its reality and importance, by declaring its results. "Then," she says, "we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us."

It would seem, indeed, that the three members of this sentence, stand together in a graduated order, Spiritually to eat the flesh of Christ, and to drink his blood is the effectual means of blessing; to dwell in Christ, and Christ in us, is the substance of that blessing; and to be one with Christ, and Christ with us, is its consummation and perfection. We

are thus materially aided, in ascertaining the import of the first position; which must of necessity have been deemed such, as to warrant the second and third. Let us consider, then, what that eating of Christ's flesh, and drinking of his blood, in and through the eucharistic symbols (with which our Church, strictly following our Lord's words of institution, combines the heavenly blessing) must be, in order to such real, and divinely substantial results. Let us weigh the expressions, by the strictest rule of verbal appreciation; and shall we find it possible to apply any other than the deepest and most practical meaning, to our "dwelling in Christ, and Christ's dwelling in us?" It can amount to nothing less, than that we are made habitual possessors of that supernatural grace, with the sufficiency of which St. Paul was comforted, under his most afflicting infirmity of animal nature; and the divinity of which evinced itself, by the contrast of the strength which it infused, with the conscious weakness of the receiver.

Nothing less than this, I say, can be implied in those significant words; and if they comprehended nothing more, it would be impossible to reduce the benefit, which they describe, to any unsubstantial generality. If we dwell in Christ, we must have some conscious evidence of our high and holy resting place; and our minds and hearts must rationally and satisfactorily feel, that they are no longer captives to the world, the flesh, or the devil. To dwell in

Christ, is to possess an effectual refuge from the strength of every possible temptation, and to have an unfailing resource in every trial, during our earthly pilgrimage, to which our mortal nature remains exposed. If we dwell in Christ, we no longer live in sin; we no longer cleave to the world; we are no longer the helpless victims of earthly vicissitudes; but amongst the sundry and manifold changes of the world, our hearts are surely there fixed, where true joys are to be found. "In the world," said our Lord to his apostles, "ye shall have tribulation; but in me, ye shall have peace." To dwell in Christ, therefore, is to enjoy this peace; the peace of a mind no longer distracted by unruly passions, no longer led astray by foolish and hurtful lusts, but preserved from inward, as well as outward deviations, by its adherence to its centre of rest and safety; and kept, as in a fortress, by the power of God, through faith, unto salvation.

To have Christ dwelling in us, though necessarily consequent on our dwelling in Him, implies something still more excellent and happy. Our dwelling in Christ includes all that belongs to spiritual liberty and security. It is the perfect verification of what the psalmist has declared: "Whoso dwelleth under the defence of the Most High, shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty." But to have Christ dwelling in us, is to be made spiritually rich, as well as spiritually secure. He dwells in us, only so far as he inspires us with the mind and tempers, the

virtues and graces, of which He himself is the infinite fountain. "We saw his glory," says St. John, "the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth; and of his fulness have all we received, even grace for grace;" each particular grace which was in Him, being specifically infused into the members of his mystical body. It is, then, by the infusion of this fulness, that Christ is said, in the New Testament, to dwell in his faithful disciples. This is that spiritual mystery, the riches of the glory of which, St. Paul was divinely commissioned to make known among the Gentiles; for nothing less than this would verify his sublime definition of it: "which is," says he, "Christ in you, the hope of glory."

I am well aware, that I am giving to the language of our Church a far deeper sense, than it may have been the common custom to apply to it; but I believe that it is only from want of adequate consideration, that its weighty meaning could have been overlooked. It could not have been the intention of the Church on any occasion, and least of all in this most solemn ordinance, to use vague, or rhetorical expressions. It was doubtless, now, eminently her purpose, to "speak as the oracles of God;" and while she does not hesitate to place before her chrildren the highest and holiest "things, pertaining to the kingdom" of our Lord, she employs terms, which the entire tenour of the New Testament at once sanctions and explains. There is no support or resource, which the

Gospel holds out to us, which is not included in our dwelling in Christ: there is no height of moral and spiritual excellence, to which it invites our aspiring, which is not comprehended in Christ's dwelling in us. But these blessings and graces, when most real and genuine, still admit of advancement; and that advancement being described by St. Paul, as the "growing up unto Him, in all things, which is the head, even Christ," our Church has terminated its statement of eucharistic blessings, in our being "one with Christ, and Christ with us."

Did these words stand alone, they would, even then, scarcely admit of any other, than an inward and spiritual meaning; but, as coming after, and connected with, those which precede them, that sense is indispensable. It must, moreover, be observed, that in these specific declarations of sacramental results, our Church repeats only in substance, what had been pronounced by our Redeemer. "He," said Christ, "that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him;" and he immediately adds that still stronger and deeper declaration, which clearly suggested, and no less clearly supports, the third position; "We are one with Christ, and Christ with us." For such must be, indeed, our happy condition, when these words are fulfilled in us: "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." To live spiritually by Christ, is, in the most

important sense, to be one with him; we must therefore conclude, that in stating our unity with Christ, to be, as it were, the crowning result of a right reception of Christ in the eucharistic ordinance, our Church means, by this scriptural term, to designate, not only the reality, but the maturity of an inward and spiritual life, through that union with him which he himself has illustrated, by that of the branches of a vine, with the main stem, by which they are sustained and nourished.

That it is the maturity of the spiritual life, which those last words of the passage are meant to express, appears from this consideration, that nothing more exalted is conceivable, than the notion which is here conveyed. It is for some great and glorious purpose, that Christ would bless us with that mysterious intercommunication, which He has described, as our dwelling in him, and his dwelling in us. And no imaginable result of this divine vouchsafement, could be either, more glorious, or more natural, than our inner man being so imbued with the influences of incarnate Godhead, as to make us in every movement of heart and life, of the same mind and spirit with our Divine Head. On the other hand, can any thing short of such an assimilation, realize our being one with him, and his being one with us, as a consequence of our dwelling in him, and his dwelling in us? The self-evident interiority of this antecedent blessing, obliges us to understand the consequent

blessing in a like interior sense. And so understood, it presents to us a consummation of the evangelic process, which, doubtless, in itself, admits of still higher and higher degrees of advancement; but beyond which, as to kind and nature, nothing of greater excellence can be conceived.

In fact, there is not a single high attainment of St. Paul himself, except those of a miraculous kind, which is not comprehended, in such union with the Divine Redeemer, as is here made to flow, from right reception of the Eucharist. When that Apostle declares, that he was crucified with Christ, and that it was not he who lived, but Christ who lived within him; and when he elsewhere says, that, in every thing, and in all things, he was instructed (as his own Greek word, with singular significancy, imports, by an advancement, or initiation, into the inner mysteries of the Gospel,)* both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer want; in a word, to be able to do all things, through internal strength from his Redeemer†; he evidently does nothing more than exemplify, in instances the most exalted, and yet the most appropriate, his being "one with Christ, and Christ with him."

In the remarkable passage, therefore, which has been adduced, and particularly in its concluding sentence, our Church not only declares her deep and

* Ἐν παντὶ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι μεμύημαι. Phil. iv. 12.

† Πάντα ἰσχύω ἐν τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντί με Χριστῷ. Phil. iv. 13.

comprehensive sense of the Eucharistical blessing, but she also teaches all her children, the high estimate which they are to make of their Christian vocation. She thus instructs them, that there is an invisible Christianity, to which their visible Christianity is merely subservient and instrumental; and that that invisible Christianity is, strictly and perfectly, what it was in the time of the Apostles, and even in the Apostles themselves; that it is that kingdom of heaven, which our Lord declares to be *within the soul*, and which St. Paul describes, as righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. It is, therefore, inconsistent and vain, for any professed disciple of our Church, to plead for a formal, cold, and ineffective Christianity. This single passage confutes, and ought to silence, every such false brother. The verification of this one statement of internal beatitude, would not only raise the soul, infallibly, above the storms and tempests of this lower world, but would imply an anticipation of Paradise, a solid and undelusive commencement of the very heaven of heaven, in the mind and heart.

For, be it well observed, that these expressions of our Church, interpreted, as they alone can be, by the numerous passages which correspond to them in the New Testament, will be found to convey no intimation of any thing rapturous or visionary. A warm imagination, and want of wise guidance, have, doubtless, too often betrayed intentionally devout persons,

into passionate elevations of mind, and supposed unions with their Saviour, in which assurances seemed to be given them of divine favour, and everlasting safety; though in a way as unintelligible to all others, as, it may be feared, it was hazardous to themselves. But our Church so raises the Christian ardour of her children, as, by their very elevation, to ensure their sobriety. The blessings, which she places before them, are exclusively of a moral nature. It is in this way, only, that the scriptural expressions, of our dwelling in Christ, and of Christ's dwelling in us, of our being one with Christ, and Christ with us, are used, in those divine oracles from whence they are taken. They who examine the New Testament attentively and candidly, must discover, that an union with the incarnate Word, in spirit and temper, in heart and mind, is the glorious result, to which all the beams of evangelical light converge, and in which they terminate: and it will equally be seen, in every part of our invaluable formulary, that the Church of England has adhered to this divine guidance. Every aspiration which she excites, every exercise of mind in which she engages us, every depth of feeling which she aims at producing, every height of spiritual beatitude to which she invites and urges us, all is divinely moral. It is a moral faith in Christ, which, in her view, is our only path to safety and happiness; it is a moral love of God, which she deems the essence of our spiritual life; it is a moral

maturity, the bringing forth "the fruits of the spirit," in which she places its present consummation. The result she thus looks for, the prize which she thus proposes, is, at once, the most sober and the most sublime: so sober, as to leave no room for the slightest mixture of visionary delusion; yet so sublime, as to evince to the mind and heart of the possessor, that the moral person, the moral affections, and the moral enjoyments, which have grown up within him, are no more the effect of his own mere exertions, than the flowing of his blood is the effect of his continued volition.

While, therefore, the Church of England suggests no subject of solicitude, and proposes no object of pursuit, but such as are essentially moral (all her divine philosophy being ultimately resolvable, into that one brief, but most comprehensive oracle: "Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God");* she no less earnestly teaches, that, from the first to the last step of our Christian course, we can accomplish nothing effectually by our own power, but must obtain, both the implantation, and the increase, of every pure principle, of every right temper, and of

* Genuine disciples of the Church of England have expressed their strong persuasion, that this beatitude is not confined to heaven. "If," says the excellent Townson, "the pure in heart have a promise, as of a congenial reward, that they shall hereafter see God, we may believe, that, in such measure as their hearts are pure, they will have a capacity for some anticipation of this blessed vision here on earth." The sublimity of this thought is equalled only by its sobriety.

every spiritual affection, from the grace of God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ, infused into us by the operation of the Holy Ghost.

The height of beatific purity and virtue, then, to which as Christians we are called to rise, and the influences from above, by which alone we can thus, by anticipation, dwell in God's tabernacle, and rest upon his holy hill, are the two grand points, to which all the devotional forms of our Church are directed. Concluding the *matter* of our true happiness to consist, in a virtual, but vital commencement of our future heaven, and the indispensable means of that happiness, not less to consist, in a really divine communication, our Church aims at forming us to such habits and feelings of devotion, as must imply a constant commerce of the heart with heaven, and a gradual approximation to its purity, its serenity, and its happiness, through fresh and fuller infusion of that eternal life, which God has given us in his Son.

Such, I say, is the uniform import and design of all our established services. Their object is to raise us to every thing, for which we were created, which can make us well pleasing to God, acceptable to men, and happy in ourselves: substantially happy, even while in the body; with the assurance of unalloyed and consummate happiness hereafter. And for this exalted purpose, while every possible degree of fidelity and vigilance is to be exercised on our part, we are continually taught to look upward, and expect all

increase of wisdom, fortitude, or virtue, from the boundless provision made for us, in the mystery of redemption. Of this mystery, then, the Church considers the sacrament of the Eucharist, not only to be expressly and profoundly significant, but to constitute, in some sort, an instrumental organ. That grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which alone we can live, much more grow up and advance, as Christians, is, according to our Church, eminently and peculiarly conveyed to us, in and through this visible ordinance. As it is that special and appropriate grace of the Gospel, which she always has in view, that grace, which raises every living member of Christ's kingdom above even Christ's distinguished forerunner, so is it this crowning blessing of the Gospel, this concentration of all its lights, and verification of its most precious promises, which she unites, indissolubly, with the right reception of the Eucharistic symbols; "for then," says she, "we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood; then, we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us."

That our Church is supported by Holy Scripture, in this high estimate of the Eucharist, has already I trust, been sufficiently shown; nor need I again remark, that, if nothing else but the appeal of St. Paul to the universal belief of the Christian church, could be added to our Lord's words, in the 6th chapter of St. John, an indisputable ground would be established.

for the view which our Church has thus solemnly, yet most simply, placed before us.

It may be right, however, to observe, that the fulness of blessing, which, in those comprehensive words, we are encouraged to expect, cannot be understood as the result of a single reception of the Eucharist, be the disposition of the receiver ever so sincere and upright. It is, indeed, to be believed, that, in every such instance, "we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood;" that is, we receive, in this ordinance a measure, less or more, according to the divine adjustments of that ineffable influence, which it is appointed to convey. But the expressions, of our dwelling in Christ, and Christ dwelling in us; still more, of our being one with Christ, and Christ with us, are evidently not an amplification of what is in the first sentence, but are descriptive of its invaluable results; and that, too, as I have endeavoured to show, in terms so significant of advancement and consummation, as to comprehend the utmost heights of virtue and happiness, which a Christian can reach on this side of heaven. Besides, it is obvious, that, while the first of the three positions, states a specific and definite act of the qualified communicant, including in it an equally definite, though, by us, inconceivable operation of divine goodness and power, the second and third positions no less clearly convey, the idea of habitual and settled attainments; and such attainments, as must, severally, within themselves,

imply different degrees of completeness and confirmation. It is true the Church does not stop, on that solemn occasion, to explain her sense of the scriptural language which she employs. Had she done so, she would inevitably have weakened its force, and, consequently, lessened its impressiveness. She left her meaning to be found in the tenour of those passages of the New Testament, from which she derived the terms in which she speaks; and to be deduced from the very nature of the institution: I mean, from its being a rite not to be administered once only, like baptism, to each individual Christian, but, on the contrary, to be recurred to repeatedly, and continually, to the close of our pilgrimage on earth. This feature in the Eucharist, declares it to be intended for continued, and increasing benefit; I say increasing benefit, both because each right reception must add something to the character of the receiver, and, also, because that general rule must hold good in this particular instance: "Unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance." In order, therefore, to do adequate justice, to the obvious purpose of this sacred ordinance, it was necessary to declare, not only its commencing, but its progressive, and, at length, consummate conduciveness to our spiritual redemption. This our Church has accordingly attended to: and in the fewest, but most deeply weighed, and exquisitely applied words, she at once teaches the depth of blessing, which has been, as it were, deposited for

us, in the sacred Eucharist, and the height of spiritual advancement and Christian maturity, to which we may arrive, by rightly availing ourselves of that wonderfully gracious provision. In a word, it is here placed in its justest light, and manifested in its full extent: so as to appear a true and perfect antitype of that mysterious ladder, which Jacob saw, in his vision at Bethel, whose foot, indeed, was on the earth, but whose top reached to heaven.

I have thus endeavoured to explain the peculiar influences of divine grace, which distinguish the Christian dispensation; and of which the Christian ordinance of the Eucharist appears designed, by its divine author, to be the chief instrumental conduit. If, in this attempt, I have particularly dwelt on the view of this important subject, which is given by the Church of England; it is because I was convinced I could, in no other way, so fully elucidate the doctrine of Holy Scripture, and the established sense of the ancient Catholic Church.

Another point, which may possibly need further explanation, is, the peculiar comfort and confidence, which I have supposed to arise from the thought, that, in the sacred Eucharist, we do not concur, as workers together with God; but expect the blessing, directly, and exclusively, from his own Almighty power.

This distinction of the Eucharist, from all other means of grace (except the initiatory sacrament of

baptism), I have already shown to follow as a necessary result, from the actual instrumentality of the sacramental symbols. This mysterious fact being once allowed, we forthwith conceive the notion of a strictly divine and supernatural operation; inasmuch as nothing, but the divine power itself, could convey spiritual virtue, through such intrinsically weak instruments. We are thus led to feel, that the unseen agency is not only truly, but unmixedly divine; and that, by consequence, it works its purpose, not on a co-operative, but on a passive subject; I do not mean passive as to desire, or as to sincere endeavours to expel, whatever might disqualify for so sacred a vouchsafement, but passive in the actual matter of reception; in like manner as the Apostles were passive, when our Saviour breathed on them, and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

I cannot but think, then, that, in the assured prospect of a divine influence so directly and simply from God himself, there is matter of consolation, and motive for confidence, beyond what it would be reasonable to feel, in any other act or exercise of devotion. Where we ourselves are to use exertion, in order to attain an end, we may very honestly endeavour to look beyond, and above our own working, to the source of every good, as well as of every perfect gift. But those efforts will, probably, be much more sincere, than successful; and the conscious weakness or languor of the meditating, or supplicating mind, will,

in spite of every endeavour to the contrary, proportionally lessen the sense of benefit, and even the hope of a divine blessing. It is impossible to avoid this way of reckoning, in any act, which is, in its nature, contributory to the wished for purpose; and notwithstanding we expect the blessing to come from Him, "in whom is no variableness, nor shadow of turning," we cannot but apprehend, that the mental clouds and vapours, which we are unable to dispel, as well as the imperfect husbandry, which we feel we are exercising, may defraud us of our promised share in the quickening and maturing beams of the sun of righteousness.

Such occasional hindrances to devotional comfort, are not wholly to be surmounted by the deepest sincerity, nor even by a considerable growth in grace. It is enough for the disciple to be as his master; and if even the pure and holy mind of our Redeemer was so depressed, by a preternatural disturbance of his animal frame, that it was necessary for an angel from heaven to afford him a proportioned supernatural assistance, it cannot be expected but that, even in the most advanced state of the Christian life, the mind should sometimes feel its own co-operation with God to be so feeble and inadequate, as to inspire an anxious wish, that He would be pleased to infuse grace and strength into it, independently of its own exertions; and, directly and simply work in it, of his own good pleasure, both to will, and to do.

To this natural and inextinguishable appetite of the devout mind, nothing could more strictly or more perfectly correspond, than the institution of the Eucharist, as designated by our Redeemer, and explained by his Apostle. To that Apostle, in an hour of deep anxiety, on account of some oppressive infirmity in his animal frame, his divine Master gave this appropriate consolation, "my grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness." A more cheering or animating assurance could not have been given, than that contained in these words; and especially in the latter clause of the sentence, which, I conceive, contains in it that very notion of divine aid and blessing, which is so peculiarly needed to help our infirmity; and is so signally provided for, in a sacred ordinance, wherein, as I have endeavoured to show, the nature of the means evinces, the direct, and exclusive agency of omnipotence.

It was, specifically, the grace of Christ, which was to prove sufficient for St. Paul; it was his strength, the strength of God manifest in the flesh, which was to be made perfect in the Apostle's weakness. In how many various ways this promise was to be fulfilled, it is not for us to pronounce; but when the same blessed Apostle spoke, fourteen years after, of the communion of Christ's blood, and the communion of Christ's body, can we doubt, that, in these significant terms, he essentially included, or rather, in the stongest manner possible, denoted, that very com-

munication of grace and strength from our Saviour, in which he himself had found such adequate support; and which, instead of being counteracted, was made more glorious, by the weakness of the receiver? What else than this could be meant, by the communion of Christ's blood, and the communion of Christ's body? Surely, in such a communication of grace and strength, the divine words, "He that eateth me, even he shall live by me," would have their clear, and perfect fulfilment: and it was no less evident, that, in the sacred institution, which was to give effect to those words, the divine strength signally accommodated itself to human weakness. As I have just observed, the gracious assurance given to St. Paul, and, through him, to all faithful Christians, might be verified in various other ways, as exigencies should require. But the sacrament of the Lord's supper, bore the special mark and signature, of this very end and purpose. Its nature and character was such as to imply, that, in this means of grace, the good which was done, God would do it himself; and, by consequence, the co-operation of mind on the part of the receiver, which, in all the common means of edification, must be deemed indispensable, was, in the Eucharist, peculiarly and mysteriously superseded; and *capacity*, the sole requisite, for reception of the heavenly blessing.

Need I then say more to show, how eminently and impressively, in this wonderful provision, the strength of Christ is made perfect in weakness; and

how appositely the weakness of the instrumental medium is fitted, to console and satisfy, the deepest and most depressing sense of weakness, in the receiver; Does not the very aspect of such an ordinance, significant as it is of so gracious a purpose, and presenting so express a pledge of that purpose being accomplished, convey stronger and more direct consolation to the drooping spirit, than could be administered in any forms of speech? And, in its stated and continually recurring celebration,* are we not instructed, that it is chiefly, and peculiarly, by the pure and undiluted grace of Christ, thus, from time to time, communicated to us through his own direct operation, we are to live and grow as Christians; to receive supplies of divine strength, notwithstanding all our oppressing infirmities; and, if we honestly and assiduously improve the heavenly gift thus assured to us, to attain, at length, to the fulness of the Christian character, and to complete fitness for the inheritance of the saints in light?

But let it not be supposed, that, in excluding all strict and proper co-operation of the communicant, in his reception of the Eucharistic blessing, I wish to lessen the importance, or question the necessity, of due predisposition, in order to that reception. While the nature of the blessing evinces, not only the divine

* The Eucharist, at the first, was celebrated every Lord's Day; and the fitness of this practice is still recognised, in various instances and manners, in the Latin, Greek, Angelican churches.

source from which it comes, and the divine agency by which it is bestowed, but also its complete distinctness from all concurrent agency, except that which is outwardly ministerial, it no less implies a capacity of reception, in him on whom it is conferred. It is a spiritual blessing; and, therefore, not communicable to an oppositely disposed mind. We cannot co-operate in the divine act, because it is so purely divine, as to exclude even subordinate co-agency; but we may obstruct, or wholly resist its effect, by a positive unpreparedness for any such benefit. It is as true, as it is consolatory, that our involuntary defects, can be no obstacle to the divine Omnipotence; but, where the grace of God is in no degree desired, and, still more, where there is an actual aversion to it, a communication of that peculiar grace, which the Eucharist is intended to convey, would be inconceivable, if not morally impossible.

There must, evidently, be a spiritual appetite, in order to the apprehension, much more the reception, of a spiritual blessing. "Blessed are they," said our Saviour, "who hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled." Their blessedness consists, we see, in their desire being satisfied: they could not be blessed, therefore, if that desire were wanting. This rule holds good, eminently, repecting the Lord's supper. It is the most distinguished conduit of that heavenly grace, whereby the kingdom of God is established, advanced, and completed in the mind and

heart. But where no desire for this divine grace has been awakened, and no apprehension of its value and necessity is entertained, the provision made by our Redeemer for its conveyance, can excite, neither rational interest, nor adequate reverence.

I precisely mean, however, where there is no such desire, and no such apprehension: because it is certain, that under deep obscurity of mental vision, there may be sincere aspirations of the inner man, the nature of which may be very indistinctly understood, by the mind which forms them. In all such instances, therefore,—as there is safety in approaching, so we cannot doubt, that there will be benefit in receiving the Eucharistic symbols. He who sincerely desires to serve God, and to be possessed of Christian virtues, and who goes to the table of our Lord, with a wish that he may thereby become more religious, and more virtuous, however dark his apprehension of the high and holy mystery, which the sacrament of the Eucharist implies and exhibits, will not, we may well believe, go in vain to that ordinance, for this very reason, because the blessing which it instrumentally communicates, is so exclusively divine. Let there be only a capacity of receiving, and a desire, whether explicit or constructive, to receive influence from above, and, on the ground of a strictly divine operation, there is the most cheering certainty, that no sincere and upright individual will go empty away.

Thus, what was said of the type, is no less true of the antitype, that he who gathered much, had nothing over; and he who gathered little, had no lack. As the bodily weakness of an Israelite, by this merciful supervention of divine power, even in the act of gathering, did not prevent his carrying away the portion of food convenient for him, so, much more, where the very act of gathering is superseded, by the unmixed fulness of divine operation, may a like result be confidently expected.

From this view, therefore, of the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, we not only derive an encouragement with respect to ourselves, which, even in our most advanced state in this world, may not be unnecessary, but we also learn to look with increased satisfaction, on that occasional concourse of communicants, which is excited by the recurrence of our great Christian festivals. Reason unites with charity in assuring us, that a sincere religious intention actuates, at least a great number of those, who approach the Christian altar, at those solemn seasons; and it is only on the plainest grounds, that we can place a limit to this kindly calculation. May we not, then, humbly believe, that in proportion as there is an opening for it, the divine influence dispensed, through that bread and that cup, enters into many an heart, which is speculatively unconscious of the blessing it is receiving and inspires it with holy desires, good counsels, and just works? The benefits thus conferred, may as

much escape human observation, as the reserved seven thousand in Israel, had escaped the observation of the prophet Elijah. But we may well be confident that, when the divine benignity has reserved to itself, in the Christian dispensation, a medium of benediction, simply and exclusively its own, the effect is as much beyond *man's* narrow reckoning, as God's ways are higher than man's ways, and his thoughts than man's thoughts.

Were no spiritual good done, in Christian communities, but through human agency, the eternal interests of individuals would be poorly provided for, both as to the nature, and extent, of the benefits communicated: and it will accordingly be found, that, in proportion as human instruments are looked up to, and trusted in, the best results are, in their character, mixed and superficial. The depths of the heart do not seem to be reached; the mind too often appears to support itself by theoretical consolations; and the frailties of animal and corrupted nature are combated and restrained, rather than conquered and expelled. But whenever God himself is directly and immediately resorted to, the effects, though it may be less perceptible by the eye of man, are of a deeper and more inward character, and imply much more of an entire transmutation. It is not a professional, but a radical religion, which is thus produced. There is, in such instances, no thought of profession, because it is a concern which lies wholly between the heart and its God

To such a process, then, the provision of sacramental grace appears to be exquisitely adapted. It affords, to the secret and unprofessing disciple, that immediate commerce with his God and Saviour, which his heart desires, in the simplest and sublimest way; and while it makes him independent of those human aids, which rise, and fall and fluctuate with circumstances, it teaches him a dependence, on the unseen source of his spiritual life and strength, which is as humble, as it is stable. Both himself and his fellow creatures appear to him as nothing, where God is so signally, and so graciously, all in all.

APPENDIX,

BEING THE FIRST SECTION OF BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR'S TREATISE ENTITLED "THE REAL PRESENCE AND SPIRITUAL, OF CHRIST IN THE BLESSED SACRAMENT, PROVED AGAINST THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION."

1. The tree of knowledge became the tree of death to us; and the tree of life is now become an apple of contention. The holy symbols of the eucharist were intended to be a contesseration, and a union of christian societies to God, and with one another; and the evil taking it, disunites us from God; and the evil understanding it, divides us from each other. Οὐκοῦν δεινόν, εἰ γῆ χρηστὴ μὲν ἁμαρτοῦσ' ὧν χρεὼ ἑαυτὴν τυχεῖν, κακὸν βίβωσι καρπόν. And yet if men would but do reason, there were in all religion no articles which might more easily excuse us from meddling with questions about it, than this of the holy sacrament. For as the man in Phœdrus, that being asked what he carried hidden under his cloak; answered it was hidden under his cloak; meaning, that he would not have hidden it, but that he intended it should be secret;—so we may say in this mystery to them that curiously ask, what or how it is? "Mysterium est;" "It is a sacrament, and a mys-

tery," by sensible instruments it consigns spiritual graces; by the creatures it brings us to God; by the body it ministers to the spirit. And that things of this nature are indiscernible secrets, we may learn by the experience of those men, who have, in cases not unlike, vainly laboured to tell us, how the material fire of hell should torment an immaterial soul, and how baptismal water should cleanse the spirit, and how a sacrament should nourish a body, and make it sure of the resurrection.

2. It was happy with christendom, when she, in this article, retained the same simplicity which she always was bound to do in her manners and intercourse; that is, to believe the thing heartily, and not to inquire curiously; and there was peace in this article for almost a thousand years together; and yet that transubstantiation was not determined, I hope to make very evident: "In synaxi transubstantiationem serò definivit ecclesia: diù satis erat credere, sive sub pane consecrato, sive quocunque modo adesse verum corpus christi;" so said the great Erasmus:* "It was late before the Church defined transubstantiation; for a long time together it did suffice to believe, that the true body of Christ was present, whether under the consecrated bread or any other way:" so the thing was believed, the manner was not stood upon. And it is a famous saying of Durandus;† "Verbum audimus, motum sentimus, modum nescimus, præsentiam

* 1 Cor. vii. † Neand. Synops. Chron. p. 203.

credimus:" "we hear the word, we perceive the motion, we know not the manner, but we believe the presence;" and Ferus* of whom Sixtus Senensis† affirms that he was "vir nobiliter doctus, pius et eruditus," hath these words: "Cum certum sit ibi esse corpus Christi, quid opus est dispatare, num panis substantia maneat, vel non?" "When it is certain that Christ's body is there, what need we dispute whether the substance of bread remain or no?" and therefore Cuthbert Tonstal, bishop of Duresme, would have every one left to his conjecture concerning the manner: "De modo quo id fieret, satius erat curiosum quemque relinquere suæ conjecturæ, sicut liberum fuit ante concilium Lateranum:"‡ "Before the Lateran council, it was free for every one to opine as they please, and it were better it were so now." But St. Cyril§ would not allow so much liberty; not that he would have the manner determined, but not so much as thought upon, "Firmam fidem mysteriis adhibentes, nonquam in tam sublimibus rebus, illud *quomodo,* aut cogitemus aut proferamus." For if we go about to think it or understand it, we loose our labour. "Quomodo enim id fiat, ne in mente intelligere, nec lingua dicere possumus, sed silentio et firma fide id suscipimus:" "We can perceive the thing by faith, but cannot express it in words, nor understand

* In Matt. xxvi.

† Biblioth. Sixt. Senensis, lib. 4 tit Johannes Ferus.

‡ Tonstal. de Eucharist, lib. 1. p. 46.

§ Cyril in Joh. lib 4. c. 13.

it with our mind" said St. Bernard* "Oportet igitur, (it is at last, after the steps of the former progress, come to be a duty,) nos in sumtionibus divinorum mysteriorum indubitatam retinere fidem, et non quærere quo pacto." The sum is; The manner was defined but very lately: there is no need at all to dispute it; no advantages by it; and therefore it were better it were left at liberty to every man to think as he please; for so it was in the church for above a thousand years together; and yet it were better men would not at all trouble themselves concerning it; for it is a thing impossible to be understood; and therefore it is not fit to be inquired after. This was their sense: and I suppose we do, in no sense, prevaricate their so pious and prudent counsel by saying "The presence of Christ is real and spiritual; because this account does still leave the article in his deepest mystery; not only because spiritual formalities and perfections are undiscernible and incommensurable by natural proportions, and the measures of our usual notices of things, but also because the word "spiritual" is so general a term, and operations so various and many, by which the Spirit of God brings his purposes to pass, and does his work upon the Soul, that we are in this specific term, very far from limiting the article to a minute and special manner. Our word of "spiritual presence" is particular in nothing, but that it excludes the corporal and natural manner; we say

* Epist. 77.

it is not this, but it is to be understood figuratively, that is, not naturally, but to the purposes and in the manner of the Spirit and spiritual things; which how they operate or are effected, we know no more than we know how a cherub sings or thinks, or by what private conveyances a lost notion returns suddenly into our memory, and stands placed in the eye of reason. Christ is present spiritually, that is, by effect and blessing; which, in time speaking, is rather the consequent of his presence than the formality. For though we are taught and feel *that*, yet *this* we profess we cannot understand; and therefore curiously inquire not. Σαφὴς ἔλεγχος, ἀπιστίας τὸ πᾶς περὶ Θεοῦ λέγειν, said Justin Martyr; "It is a manifest argument of infidelity to inquire concerning the things of God, *How*, or *After what manner?*" And in this it was, that many of the fathers of the church laid their hands upon their mouths, and revered the mystery, but like the remains of the sacrifice, they burnt it; that is, as ourselves expound the allegory, it was to be adored by faith, and not to be discussed with reason, knowing that, as Solomon said "Scrutator majestatis opprimetur à gloriâ:" "He that pries too far into the majesty shall be confounded with the glory."

3. So far it was very well; and if the error or interest had not unravelled the secret and looked too far into the sanctuary, where they could see nothing but a cloud of fire, majesty and secrecy indiscriminately mixed together,—we had kneeled before the same

altars, and adored the same mystery, and communicated in the same rites, to this day. For, in the thing itself, there is no difference amongst wise and sober persons; nor ever was, till the manner became an article, and declared or supposed to be of the substance of the thing. But now the state of the question is this:

4. The doctrine of the Church of England, and generally of the protestants in this article is,—that after the minister of the holy mysteries hath rightly prayed, and blessed or consecrated the bread and the wine, the symbols become changed into the body and blood of Christ, after a sacramental, that is, in a spiritual real manner: so that all that worthily communicate, do by faith receive Christ really, effectually to all the purposes of his passion; the wicked receive not Christ, but the bare symbols only: but yet to their hurt,* because the offer of Christ is rejected, and they pollute the blood of the covenant, by using it as an unholy thing. The result of which doctrine is this: it is bread, and it is Christ's body. It is bread in substance, Christ in the sacrament; and Christ is as really given to all that are truly disposed, as the symbols are; each as they can, and to the same real purposes to which they are designed; and Christ does as really nourish and sanctify the soul, as the elements do the body. It is here, as in the other sa-

* Dum enim sacramenta violantur, ipse cujus sunt sacramenta violatur—S. Hieron. in 1 Malac.

crament; for as there natural water becomes the laver of regeneration; so here bread and wine becomes the body and blood of Christ; but there and here too, the first substance is changed by grace, but remains the same in nature.

5. That this is the doctrine of the church of England is apparent in the church catechism, affirming "the inward part or thing signified" by the consecrated bread and wine to be "the body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received of the faithful in the Lord's supper:" and the benefit of it to be, "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the body and blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine:" and the same is repeated severally in the exhortation, and in the prayer of the address before the consecration, in the canon of our communion; "verily and indeed" is "reipsâ," that is "really enough;" that is our sense of the real presence; and Calvin* affirms as much, saying "In the supper, Christ Jesus, viz: his body and blood, is truly given under the signs of bread and wine." And Gregory de Valentiâ gives this account of the doctrine of the protestants; that "although Christ be corporeally in heaven, yet is he received of the faithful communicants in this sacrament truly, both spiritually by the mouth of the mind; through a most near conjunction of Christ with the soul of the receiver by faith, and also sacramentally with the

* Lib. 4. Inst. c. 7. sect. 32. De Missæ Sacrific.

bodily mouth," &c. And, which is the greatest testimony of all, we, who best know our own minds, declare it to be so.

6. Now that the spiritual life is also a real presence, and that they are hugely consistent, is easily credible to them, that believe that the gifts of the Holy Ghost are real graces, and a spirit is a proper substance: τὰ νοητὰ are amongst the Hellenists τὰ ἔντα, "intelligible things;" or things discerned by the mind of a man, are more truly and really such, and of a more excellent substance and reality, than things only sensible. And therefore, when things spiritual are signified by materials, the thing under the figure is called true, and the material part is opposed to it, as less true or real. The examples of this are not unfrequent in Scripture: "the tabernacle" into which the high priest entered, was a type or figure of heaven. Heaven itself is called σκηνὴ ἀληθινὴ, "the true tabernacle;"* and yet the other was the material part. And when they are joined together, that is, when a thing is expressed by a figure, ἀληθὲς, "true," is spoken of such things though they are spoken figuratively: "Christ, the true light, that lighteneth every man that cometh into the world;"† he is also "the true vine,"‡ and "verè cibus." "truly or really meat" and "panis verus è cœlo," "the true§ bread from heaven;" and spiritual goods are called "the true riches:"‖ and in the same analogy, the

* Heb. viii. 2. † John ii. 8. ‡ John xv. 1. § John vi. 32. 55.
‖ Luke xvi. 12.

spiritual presence of Christ is the most true, real, and effective; the other can be but the image and shadow of it, something in order to this: for if it were in the sacrament naturally or corporeally, it could be but in order to this spiritual, celestial, and effective presence as appears beyond exception in this; that the faithful and pious communicants receive the ultimate end of his presence, that is spiritual blessings: the wicked (who by the affirmation of the Roman doctors, do† receive Christ's body and blood in the natural and corporeal manner) fall short of that for which this is given, that is, of the blessings and benefits.

7. So that as St. Paul‡ said, "He is not a Jew, who is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outwardly, in the flesh; but he is a Jew, which is inwardly," εν τω κρυπτῶ Ἰουδαῖος and περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι, that is the real Jew, and "the true circumcision, that which is of the heart, and in the spirit;" and in this sense it is that Nathaniel is said to be αληθῶς Ἰσραηλίτης, really and "truly an Isrealite:"§ so we may say of the blessed Sacrament, "Christ is more truly and really present in spiritual presence than in corporeal, in the heavenly effect than in the natural being;" this, if it were at all, can be but the less perfect; and, therefore, we are, to the most real purposes, and in the proper sense of Scripture, the more real defenders of the real presence of Christ in

† Council, Trident sess. 4 sub Julio 3. 1551. Can. 8.

‡ Rom. ii. 28. 29. § John i. 47

the sacrament; for the spiritual sense is the most real, and most true, and most agreeable to the analogy and style of scripture, and right reason and common manner of speaking. For every degree of excellency is a degree of being, of reality, and truth; and therefore spiritual things, being more excellent than corporeal and natural, have the advantage both in truth and reality. And this is fully the sense of the christians, who use the Egyptian liturgy "Sanctifica nos, Domine noster, sicut sanctificâsti has oblationes propositas; sed fecisti illas *non fictas* (that is for *real*); et quicquid apparat, est mysterium tuum *spirituale* (that is for *spiritual*)." To all which I add the testimony of Bellarmine* concerning St. Austin; "Apud Augustinum sæpissimè illud solum dici tale, et verè tale, quod habet effectum suum conjunctum: res enim ex fructu æstimatur: itaque illos dicit verè comedere corpus Christi, qui utiliter comedunt:" "They only truly eat Christ's body, that eat it with effect; for then a thing is really or truly such, when it is not to no purpose; when it hath his effect." And in his eleventh book "against Faustus the Manichee," chap. 7, he shows that, in Scripture, the words are often so taken, as to signify not the substance, but the quality and effect, of a thing. So when it is said, "*flesh and blood* shall not inherit the kingdom of God," that is "*corruption* shall not inherit:" and in the resurrection, our bodies are said to be spiritual

* Lib. 1. Eucha. c. 14. sect. Respondeo apud.

that is, not in substance, but in effect and operation: and in the same manner he often speaks concerning the blessed sacrament; and Clemens Romanus affirms expressly, Τοῦτ' ἔστι πιεῖν τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τῆς κυριότητος μεταλαβεῖν ἀφθαρσίας. "This is to drink the blood of Jesus, to partake of the Lord's immortality."

8. This may suffice for the word "real" which the English papists much use, but, as it appears, with less reason than the sons of the church of England; and when the real presence is denied, the word "real" is taken for "natural;" and does not signify "transcendentur," or, in his just and most proper signification. But the word "substantialiter" is also used by protestants in this question: which I suppose may be the same with that which is in the article of Trent; "sacramentaliter præsens salvator substantiâ suâ nobis adest," "in substance, but after a sacramental manner:"* which words, if they might be understood in the sense in which the protestants use them, that is, really, truly, without fiction or the help of fancy, but "in rei veritate," so, as Philo calls spiritual things αναγκαιότατα, οὐσίαι, "most necessary, useful, and material substances," it might become an instrument of a united confession; and this is the manner of speaking which St. Bernard† used in his sermon of St. Martin, where he affirms, "In sacramento exhiberi nobis veram carnis substantiam sed spiritualiter

* Decretum de SS. Euchar. Sacra. can. 1.

† Lib. 1. Euchar. c. 2. reg. 3.

non carnaliter;" "In the sacrament is given us the true substance of Christ's body or flesh, but not carnally, but spiritually;" that is not to our mouths, but to our hearts; not to be chewed by the teeth, but to be eaten by faith. But they mean it otherwise, as I shall demonstrate by and by. In the mean time it is remarkable, that Bellarmine, when he is stating this question, seems to say the same thing, for which he quotes the words of St. Bernard, now mentioned; for he says that "Christ's body is there truly, substantially, really; but not corporally; nay, you may say spiritually;" and now a man would think we had him sure; but his nature is labile and slippery, you are never the nearer for this; for first he says, "It is not safe to use the word 'spiritually:' nor yet safe to say, he is not there 'corporeally,' lest it be understood, not of the manner of his presence, but to the exclusion of the nature." For he intends not (for all these fine words) that Christ's body is present spiritually, as the word is used in Scripture, and in all common notices of usual speaking; but spiritually, with him, signifies after the manner of spirits,—which besides that it is a cozening the world in the manner of expression, is also a direct folly and contradiction, that a body should be substantially present, that is, with the nature of a body, naturally,—and yet be not as a body but as a spirit, with that manner of being with which a spirit is distinguished from a body. In vain, therefore, it is, that he denies a

carnal manner and admits a spiritual,—and ever after requires, that we believe a carnal presence, even in the very manner. But this caution and exactness in the use of the word "spiritual" is, therefore, carefully to be observed, lest the contention of both parties should seem trifling, and to be for nothing. We say that Christ's body is in the sacrament "really, but spiritually." For so Bellarmine is bold to say, that the word may be allowed in this question. Where now is the difference? Here, by "spiritually" they mean "present after the manner of a spirit;" by "spiritually" we mean "present to our spirits only;" that is, so as Christ is not present to any other sense but that of faith or spiritual susception; but their way makes his body to be present in no way but that which is impossible, and implies a contradiction; a body not after the manner of a body, a body like a spirit; a body without a body; and a sacrifice of body and blood without blood: "corpus incorporeum, cruor incruentus." They say that Christ's body is truly present there, as it was upon the cross, but not after the manner of all or any body, but after that manner of being as an angel is in a place:—that is there spiritually. But we, by the real spiritual presence of Christ, do understand Christ to be present, as the spirit of God is present in the hearts of the faithful, by blessing and grace; and this is all which we mean besides the tropical and figurative presence.

9. That which seems of hardest explication is the word "corporaliter," which I find that Melancthon used: saying, "corporaliter quoque communicatione carnis Christi Christum in nobis habitare;" which manner of speaking I have heard, he avoided, after he had conversed with Œcolampadius, who was able then to teach him, and most men, in that question; but the expression may become warrantable, and consonant to our doctrine; and means no more than "really and without fiction," or "beyond a figure;" like that of St. Paul, "In Christ dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily:"* upon which St. Austin says, "In ipso inhabitat plenitudo divinitatis corporaliter, quia in templo habitaverat umbraliter;" and in St. Paul, σκία καὶ σῶμα are opposed, "which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ;"† that is "the substance," "the reality," the correlative of the type and figure, the thing signified; and among the Greeks σωματοποιεῖν signifies "solidare," "to make firm, real, and consistent;" but among the fathers σῶμα, or "body" signifies πᾶν τὸ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς το εἶναι γενόμενον, "every thing that is produced from nothing," saith Phavorinus, that is, every thing that is real "extra non ens," that hath a proper being; so that we, receiving Christ in the sacrament "corporally" or "bodily" understand that we do it really, by the ministry of our bodies receiving him into our souls. And thus we affirm Christ's body to be pre-

* Col. ii. 9. † Col ii. 17.

sent in the sacrament: not only in type or figure, but in blessing and real effect; that is, more than in the types of the law; the shadows were of the law, "but the body is of Christ."* And besides this; the word "corporally" may be very well used, when by it is only understood a corporal sign. So St. Cyril of Jerusalem in his third catechism says, that the "Holy Ghost did descend corporally in the likeness of a dove;" that is, in a type or representment of a dove's body (for so he and many of the ancients did suppose): and so he† again uses the word: "Jesus Christ, as a man, did inspire the Holy Spirit corporally into his apostles;" whereby "corporally" it is plain he means by a corporal or material sign or symbol" viz: "by breathing upon them and saying, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." In either of these senses if the word be taken, it may indifferently be used in this question.

10. I have been the more careful to explain the question, and the use of these words according to our meaning in the question, for these two reasons. 1. Because until we are agreed upon the signification of the words, they are equivocal; and by being used on both sides to several purposes, sometimes are pretended as instruments of union, but indeed effect it not; but sometime displease both parties, while each suspects the word in a wrong sense. And this hath with very ill effect been observed in the conferences

* Col ii. 17. † Dial. de Incar Unig.

for composing the difference in this question; particularly that of Poissy, where it was propounded in these words "credimus in usu cænæ Dominicæ verè, reipsâ, substantialiter, seu in substantià verum corpus, et sanguinem Christi spirituali et ineffabili modo esse, exhiberi, sumi, à fidelibus communicantibus."* Beza and Gallasius for the reformed, and Espencæus and Monlucius for the Romanists undertook to propound it to their parties. But both rejected it: for though the words were not disliked, yet they suspected each other's sense. But now that I have declared what is meant by us in these words, they are made useful in the explicating the question. 2. But because the words do perfectly declare our sense, and are owned publicly, in our doctrine and manner of speaking, it will be in vain to object against us, those sayings of the fathers which use the same expressions; for if by virtue of these words, "really, substantially, corporally, verily and indeed, and Christ's body and blood" the fathers shall be supposed to speak for "transubstantiation;" they may as well suppose it to be our doctrine too, for we use the same words, and therefore those authorities must signify nothing against us, unless these words can be proved in them to signify more than our sense of them does import; and by this truth, many, very many of their pretences are evacuated.

* Eccles. Hist. Eccles. Gallic. lib. 4. p. 604, 605. et comment. de Statu Relig. et reip. sub. Carolo 9. A. D. 1561. et Thuanum, Hist. lib. 28. ad eundem annum.

11. One thing more I am to note in order to the same purposes; that, in the explication of this question, it is much insisted upon, that it be inquired whether, when we say we believe Christ's body to be "really" in the sacrament, we mean, "that body, that flesh, that was born of the Virgin Mary," that was crucified, dead, and buried? I answer I know none else that he had or hath; there is but one body of Christ, natural and glorified; but he that says that body is glorified, which was crucified, says it is the same body, but not after the same manner:* and so it is in the sacrament; we eat and drink the body and blood of Christ, that was broken and poured forth; for there is no other body, no other blood of Christ; but though it is the same which we eat and drink, yet it is in another manner; and therefore, when any of the protestant divines, or any of the fathers,† deny that body which was born of the Virgin Mary, that which was crucified to be eaten in the sacrament, —as Bertram, as St. Jerome, as‡ Clemens Alexandrinus, expressly affirm; the meaning is easy;—they intend that it is not eaten in a natural sense; and then calling it "corpus spirituale," the word "spiritual,"

* See Bp. Ridley's answer to Curtop's first argument in his disp. at Oxford. Fox Martyol. p. 1451. vet. edit.

† Vide infrà, sect. 12.

‡ Duplicitur verò sanguis Christi et caro intelligitur, spiritualis illa, atque divina, de quâ ipse dixit Caro mea verè est cibus, &c; vel caro et sanguis, quæ cruciñxa est, et qui militis effusus est lanceâ in Epist. Ephes. c. 1.

is not a substantial predication, but is an affirmation of the manner, though, in disputation, it be made the predicate of a proposition, and the opposite member of a distinction. "That body which was crucified, is not that body that is eaten in the sacrament,"—if the intention of the proposition be to speak of the eating it in the same manner of being; but "that body which was crucified, the same body we do eat," if the intention be to speak of the same thing in several manners of being and operating: and this I noted that we may not be prejudiced by words, when the notion is certain and easy: and thus far is the sense of our doctrine in this article.

12. On the other side, the church of Rome uses the same words we do, but wholly to other purposes, affirming: 1. That after the words of consecration, on the altar there is no bread; in the chalice there is no wine. 2. That the accidents,* that is, the colour the shape, the bigness, the weight, the smell, the nourishing qualities, of bread and wine, do remain but neither in the bread nor in the body of Christ, but by themselves, that is, so that there is whiteness, and nothing white; sweetness, and nothing sweet, &c. 3. That in the place of the substance of bread and wine, there is brought the natural body of Christ, and his blood that was shed upon the cross. 4. That the flesh of Christ is eaten by every communicant good and bad, worthy and unworthy. 5. That this is con-

* Council. Trid. decretum de SS. Euchar. Sacram.

veniently, properly and most aptly, called transubstantiation, that is, a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of Christ's natural body, of the whole substance of the wine into his blood. In the process of which doctrine they oppose "spiritualiter" to "sacramentaliter" and "realiter" supposing the spiritual manducation, though done in the sacrament by a worthy receiver not to be sacramental and real.*

13. So that now the question is not whether the symbol be changed into Christ's body and blood, or no? for it is granted on all sides: but whether this conversion be sacramental and figurative? or whether it be natural and bodily? Nor is it whether Christ is really taken, but whether he be taken in a spiritual or in a natural manner? We say, the conversion is figurative, mysterious, and sacramental; they say it is proper, natural, and corporal; we affirm, that Christ is really taken by faith, by the Spirit, to all real effects of his passion; they say, he is taken by the mouth, and that the Spiritual and the virtual taking him in virtue or effect, is not sufficient, though done also in the sacrament. "Hic Rhodus, hic saltus." This thing I will try by Scripture, by reason, by sense and by tradition.

* Can. 8. Anathematis.

FINIS.

PUBLISHED BY JOS. ROBINSON.

A VINDICATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, FROM THE ERRORS AND CORRUPTIONS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME—wherein, as is largely proved, the Rule of Faith, and all the Fundamental Articles of the Christian Religion are received, taught, professed and acknowledged. By DR. GEORGE BULL, late Bishop of St. David's. First American Edition, with an Advertisement by the Right Rev. W. R. WHITTINGHAM, D.D. Bishop of Maryland.—[Price 50 Cents.]

DISCOURSES ON ROMANISM AND DISSENT. By WILLIAM DODSWORTH, M. A. Perpetual Curate of Ch. Church, St. Pancras, [Price 50 Cents.]

A TREATISE ON THE USE AND IMPORT OF THE EUCHARISTIC SYMBOLS. By ALEXANDER KNOX, ESQ. with a Prefatory Letter and a Postscript, by the Author; and an Appendix, extracted from Bishop JEREMY TAYLOR.—[Price 50 Cents.]

THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.—A Sermon. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D. D. Reg. Prof. of Hebrew, Canon of Ch. Church, &c.—[Price 12½ Cents.]

THE CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD. By the Hon. & Rev. A. P. PERCEVAL, B. C. L. Chaplain in ordinary to the Queen.—[Price 6¼ Cents.]

PRIMARY CHARGE, delivered to the Clergy of Edinburg, in the Scotish Episcopal Church. By C. H. TERROT, D. D. Bishop.—[Price 6¼ Cents.]

In Press,

THE BOOK OF RATRAMN the Priest and Monk of Corbey, commonly called Bertram, on the Body and Blood of the Lord. To which is added, an Appendix, containing the Saxon Homily of Ælfric.

500

265.323I
K77

Knox. Alexander Esq. 1843

265.323I
K77
1843

500